



THE CORRESPONDENCE OF  
CHARLES ARBUTHNOT



# THE CORRESPONDENCE OF CHARLES ARBUTHNOT

EDITED FOR THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

BY

A. ASPINALL  
M.A., PH.D., F.R.HIST.S.

CAMDEN THIRD SERIES

VOLUME LXV

~~LONDON~~

OFFICES OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

96 CHEYNE WALK, S.W.10

1941



Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	vii
CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .	I
INDEX . . . . .	255
GENEALOGICAL TABLE . . . . .	<i>at end</i>



## INTRODUCTION

BORN on 14 March 1767, Charles Arbuthnot was the third son of John Arbuthnot, of Rockfleet, County Mayo, by his third wife Anne, daughter of Richard Stone, a well-known London banker. His mother's wealthy relations took charge of his education and launched him in a career. At the age of six his great-uncle, Andrew Stone, the politician and tutor of George III, left him a legacy of £3,000, and, subsequently, his great-aunt bequeathed him £20,000.<sup>1</sup>

In 1774 he was sent to a private school at Richmond, and five years later he went on to Westminster. Proceeding to Christ Church, Oxford, in 1784, he passed four years 'in idleness and amusements'. 'I lived there', he afterwards wrote, 'with a most agreeable set, but unfortunately it was not the turn of those with whom I associated, to read and study.' In 1788 he spent several months on the Continent 'in the best society', and a year later he went with Lord North's youngest son Frederick, to Denmark, Sweden, and Poland.

It was intended that he should be a lawyer, but 'the severe labour of the law' was too distasteful to him, and he idled away his time in fashionable London society until 1793, when, through the influence of a friend John King, Lord Grenville's under-secretary of state, he was offered the post of *précis*-writer in the foreign office at a salary of £300 a year. Two years later he entered the house of commons as member for East Looe, but successive diplomatic appointments interfered with a parliamentary career, and he was not again in parliament until April 1809. Within a few weeks of his election he was sent to Stockholm as secretary of legation. He returned home at the beginning of 1797, and in 1798 he went to Stuttgart to congratulate Frederick of Württemberg, George III's son-in-law, on his succession to the duchy.

In the course of this year John King again brought Arbuthnot's claims to foreign employment before Lord Grenville, with the result that he was offered the consulship at Lisbon, which, he was assured, was equal in rank and superior in value to the situation of minister plenipotentiary.<sup>2</sup> He had recently fallen in love with Miss Clapcott-Lisle, daughter of William Clapcott-Lisle and of Mrs. Lisle, the Princess of Wales's lady-in-waiting, and sister of the first marquess of Cholmondeley.<sup>3</sup> Lord Cholmondeley gave him to understand that

<sup>1</sup> The account of Charles Arbuthnot in the *DNB*, occupies no more than a column, and fails to give any impression of his political importance.

<sup>2</sup> *Dropmore papers*, iv. 425-6, 430-2.

<sup>3</sup> This was not his first attachment. There are hints of an earlier attachment in Bagot, *Canning and his friends*, i. 6-7; and he would probably have married another lady but for her untimely death.

he would stand a much better chance of success in his suit if he 'could obtain such an income as would meet with the family's approbation'. These, then, were the circumstances which made it 'particularly an object' to Arbuthnot to be nominated to some diplomatic mission. He told Lord Grenville that he had felt bound to desist from pressing his suit so long as his financial position remained uncertain, and added:<sup>1</sup>

Whether it be owing to that or to any other cause, I am obliged to own that such information has very recently been given to me on the subject of my wishes as makes me apprehend that the appearances which really were most extremely in my favour are now considerably altered. But yet from what did happen, from the observations which I was enabled to make myself, and from those also which my friends made, I can't help flattering myself that I may still succeed; though at the same time I ought not to conceal that, as there might be difficulty and even danger to my hopes in bringing this point to issue, I fear such a delay in filling up the vacancy could not be allowed by your Lordship as would permit me to take the necessary measures for obtaining the wished-for information. If, however, a delay of a few weeks could be granted to me, I trust I need not say that I would not encroach on your Lordship's goodness.

Early in 1799, therefore, Arbuthnot accepted with gratitude Lord Grenville's generous offer, and his marriage quickly followed (23 February). From June to December 1800 he was consul and chargé d'affaires at Lisbon. Grenville said that there were difficulties in the way of his succession to Robert Walpole as minister at Lisbon, and on Hookham Frere's appointment to that situation in 1800 Arbuthnot returned home.<sup>2</sup> For a year (1802-3) he was at Stockholm as envoy extraordinary, and from November 1803 until the following June he was at the foreign office as under-secretary of state.

In the summer of 1804 he was nominated ambassador to Turkey and sworn of the privy council. When diplomatic relations with the Porte were broken off in 1807, Arbuthnot had to leave Constantinople on board a British warship. In the meantime (24 May 1806), 'after seven years of the most perfect happiness', he had had the misfortune to lose his wife in childbirth. Forty years later he declared that time had never reconciled him to the loss of her. 'A more perfect creature never breathed.'

He now abandoned the diplomatic service and devoted himself to home politics. In April 1809 he re-entered the house of commons after he had been appointed to succeed his friend Henry Wellesley as joint secretary of the treasury, Huskisson being his colleague until December of that year, when loyalty to Canning caused him to resign (36). There is plenty of evidence to show that the two secretaries at this time still shared to some extent the financial and parliamentary duties of the office, but a distinction was nevertheless being evolved. In 1823, for example, Lord Harrowby commented on the difficulty of appointing 'a new Secretary to the Treasury with the department of the House of Commons';<sup>3</sup> and at the same time Herries told his cousin that he was to succeed Arbuthnot, but was to take 'the other branch of business at the Treasury'.<sup>4</sup>

Arbuthnot, serving successively under Perceval and Lord Liverpool, natur-

<sup>1</sup> *Dropmore papers*, iv 431.

<sup>2</sup> *Bathurst papers*, p 538

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, vi. 294.

<sup>4</sup> Herries MSS.

ally attached himself to the less progressive wing of the tory party, an allegiance which the periodical estrangement of Canning, the leading representative of the liberal tories, from the main tory connection left free from disturbing influences. Castlereagh, indeed, became a warm friend, but more typical were Arbuthnot's political and personal friendships with Liverpool, Wellington, Bathurst, and Peel. Unlike Peel, his politics became less rather than more liberal. In March 1813 he was still in favour of catholic emancipation,<sup>1</sup> but he never again voted in favour of the catholic claims until the question was surrendered in 1829. He had been on cordial terms with Canning until 1809,<sup>2</sup> but Canning's intrigues for the premiership, his duel with Castlereagh, and his quarrel with that section of the tory party led by Perceval, produced a change, and the old cordiality was never altogether restored, even when, after 1816, Canning was again in the cabinet. Within a few days of Canning's resignation in 1812, he was accusing Arbuthnot of writing against him in the government newspapers, and Canning would not accept his assurances that the treasury had no responsibility for the violent articles which the *Courier* had been publishing.<sup>3</sup>

Arbuthnot now made himself almost indispensable to Lord Liverpool, who became head of the treasury in 1812 after the assassination of Perceval.<sup>4</sup> Trusted and confided in by all the leading members of the government, privy to all their secrets, acting as a *liaison* between the party leaders and the rank-and-file in the house of commons, managing the government press, and smoothing away difficulties and removing differences arising between members of the government, Arbuthnot played a considerable part in politics behind the scenes, so long as the tories remained in power. 'No individual', said Wellington in 1823, 'ever rendered any Government such services as he has to this for a period of now little less than fifteen years.'<sup>5</sup>

Arbuthnot's papers, together with those of Lord Liverpool, reveal that Arbuthnot was the real, as well as the nominal, patronage secretary.<sup>6</sup> There was hardly any patronage bestowed during the premiership of Lord Liverpool on the disposal of which Arbuthnot was not consulted.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Parker's *Peel*, i 79.

<sup>2</sup> Dorothy Marshall, *Rise of George Canning*, pp. 153-4. Canning described him in 1794 as 'pleasant, quick, gentlemanly, and universally a favourite'.

<sup>3</sup> Br Mus Add. MS 38737 (Huskisson Papers), ff 385, 411.

<sup>4</sup> 'I believe,' said Arbuthnot, 'that there was scarcely anything of a public and, I might add, of a private nature, that he did not communicate to me' (Parker's *Peel*, iii. 358).

<sup>5</sup> *Bathurst papers*, p. 552. Greville wrote of him (25 August 1850): 'He had no shining parts, and never could have been conspicuous in public life; but in a subordinate and unostentatious character he was more largely mixed up with the principal people and events of his time than any other man. . . . Few men ever enjoyed so entirely the intimacy and unreserved confidence of so many statesmen and Ministers'.

<sup>6</sup> The *Annual Register's* obituary notice of 'Billy' Holmes, the tory whip, said that 'he dispensed among the members of the Lower House the greater portion of that patronage which usually passes through the hands of the Secretary to the Treasury' (*Ann. Reg.*, 1851, Appx. to Chronicle, p. 257).

<sup>7</sup> This corrects a misstatement, grounded on the authority of the *Annual Register* and of *The Times*, in my article, 'English party organization in the early nineteenth century' (*E H.R.*, July 1926, p. 397).

On 31 January 1814 he married Harriet Fane, daughter of the Hon. Henry Fane, of Fulbeck, Lincolnshire, the second son of the eighth earl of Westmorland. He met her for the first time in 1807, when she was still a schoolgirl and he in mourning for his wife. She discovered, she afterwards told him,<sup>1</sup> that he had 'more feeling and a more affectionate heart than any other man in the world', but, she added, she did not love him then. 'I wish I was only *fourteen* again,' she wrote to him in 1813, 'and then you say I could not be married, not but what I dare say I should have contrived it if you had been polite enough to have asked me, just for the sake of getting from school! But you did not care a straw for me then!' <sup>2</sup> Then she fell in love with Captain Capel, afterwards Admiral Sir Thomas Bladen Capel (1776-1853), the youngest son of the fourth earl of Essex. He had fought at Trafalgar, and, by a curious coincidence, he was the commander of H.M.'s frigate *Endymion* which brought Arbuthnot away from Constantinople at the end of January 1807. She afterwards told her husband: <sup>3</sup>

It is true I liked him, but I never loved him as I do you. Still, I did like him, for I well remember a feeling of anguish inflicted on me by a question of Lord Castlereagh's. It was in Ireland, almost the first time I ever saw him. I had been playing to him, and I was leaning on the pianoforte, and he said to me, 'Miss Fane, do you know Captain Capel? Is he going to marry Lady G. Cecil?' Had he looked at me he would have seen what I felt, but he did not observe the effect of his question, and went on talking on some other subject.

Harriet next saw Arbuthnot in the lobby of the Opera House in the summer of 1811, but she failed to recognize him. He, however, remembered her: showing her his hat, he remarked, in passing, 'You see I have a favour too!' Recalling the incident two years later, she told him, 'I'm shocked to say I went on, and said to my companion, "Who is that?" The answer was, "Mr. Arbuthnot." You must know I am the *stupidest* person at remembering faces in the world; I should forget my own if I did not look in the glass every day!' <sup>4</sup>

They met for the third time in the winter of 1812-13 at Apethorpe, the Northamptonshire seat of her cousin, the earl of Westmorland. There she fell in love with him, but her love was not at first reciprocated. Some months later she described to him the state of her feelings at that time:

You are quite right, I have never *really* loved anyone but you; and were you to ask Lady Monson she would tell you that she said to me last winter when I returned from Apethorpe, that she knew I should end by marrying you. Do you remember my asking you to frank a letter to her for me, and she formed this opinion from my having in that letter said you were the only man there I liked, and that I thought you perfect? She is so prejudiced in my favour she does not think it possible I can take a fancy to anyone without its being *mutual*, but when she made this prediction I said, 'Oh dear no, I daresay he would rather die, he scarcely ever speaks to me.' You know there is nothing I hate like asking for a frank, but I had something to send in the letter [which] made me wish for one, and all the other members were gone. I sat in the window of the breakfast-room for half an hour before I could gain *courage* to ask you; you were walking up and down the room, and you directly came up to the table and said, 'With great pleasure.' They were the

<sup>1</sup> MS. letter, postmark 4 August 1813.

<sup>2</sup> MS. letter, postmark ? 28 September 1813.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, ? 28 September 1813.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 4 August 1813.

most cordial words I had ever had from you. I remember very well your refusing to ride with me. Do not imagine what I am now going to say proceeds from vanity or self conceit, but since I came out in the world I have been so accustomed to be courted and flattered that from the most trivial circumstances possible I judge whether a person likes me or not; *picking up my pocket-handkerchief* or fetching me a chair would sooner persuade me that a person liked me than a more substantial act of kindness from one who omitted these little attentions, which I consider as not to be dispensed with from one who is *one's adorer*. Do you know what I mean? Because if you do you will own that till within these few months I never received any of those attentions from you, and therefore you cannot be surprised at my having fancied you did not like me. I remember the last night you were at Apethorpe, when I went to bed you were standing close to the door, and *you did not open it for me*. That was a *heinous crime*. The night of the illumination I was charmed because you were so afraid I should catch cold, and you wrapped me up in one of your own handkerchiefs.

In July 1813, or thereabouts, they became engaged. For seven years, he told her, he had never known a moment's happiness, but she was now sure that together they would be the happiest of human beings. A few weeks later, however, difficulties were encountered which threatened to put an end to the engagement. Some of her friends and relations were inclined to wonder at her choice of a husband who was so very much older than herself: she was still only twenty, and he was forty-six. He felt, quite wrongly, that he might be considered by her family as an 'intruder'. He had, indeed, an official salary of £4,000 a year, but it is well known that ministers were generally unable to keep their expenditure within the limits of their salaries, and that many of them, like Canning and Lord Liverpool, through no fault of their own, left office poorer than they had been when they entered into it. And Arbuthnot had to meet the heavy expense of bringing up four young children, whilst, in the event of his party being driven from office, his income would be reduced to £2,000 a year. He would then, he told her gloomily, scarcely be able to buy bread for them both! Harriet's family naturally expected him to make ample provision for his wife to meet the probable contingency of his predeceasing her, but his finances were apparently in no condition to stand such an additional strain. She had eight surviving brothers and sisters, and her mother was unable to do very much for her. The financial arrangements which her family's lawyers suggested should be made he described as 'ruinous', but these difficulties of 'settlements' were eventually overcome (perhaps it was at this time that he somehow found means of insuring his life for £10,000), and the marriage, which Harriet was confident was 'made in Heaven', took place. She delighted in the thought that they had 'always been destined for each other'. She bore him no children, but their married life was one of exceptional happiness.

Whilst they were still engaged, she tried to make him promise to take her on to the Continent whenever peace returned. 'I do not ask it now because I know it is impossible,' she wrote to him in August 1813, 'but if ever you are out of office, if ever you are able without inconvenience, will you? Say yes, and you will make me quite happy, and I shall adore you!' Her wishes were gratified in 1815, but she went, not to the Mediterranean, nor to Spain, where she had desired to see the grave of her favourite brother killed at Vitoria,



but to Paris, where she met the duke of Wellington, fresh from his triumph at Waterloo. With him she was distantly connected by marriage: her cousin, Lord Burghersh, afterwards eleventh earl of Westmorland, had married the duke's niece, Lady Priscilla Wellesley-Pole, in 1811. The duke, indeed, had known Mrs. Arbuthnot from her childhood days, for he had long been intimate with the Fane family.<sup>1</sup>

The letters here printed do not support the view that Mrs. Arbuthnot's relations with the duke of Wellington were equivocal. Few women knew either of them so intimately as Frances, Lady Shelley, who wrote: <sup>2</sup>

Their intimacy may have given gossips an excuse for scandal; but I, who knew them both so well, am convinced that the Duke was not her lover. He admired her very much—for she had a manlike sense—but Mrs. Arbuthnot was devoid of womanly passions, and was, above all, a loyal and truthful woman.

The Duke [she added] required a fireside friend, and one quite without nerves. Mrs. Arbuthnot often said that he ought to have found this at his own fireside, and how easy it would have been for his wife to have made him happy! He only asked for repose from the turmoil of public affairs, for absolute truth, and the absence of little-mindedness

Sir Robert Heron, a well-known whig member of parliament, said that 'she was highly esteemed by the first statesmen of the tory party, and as she was naturally pleased with their attentions and society, and encouraged by her husband, with whom she always lived in the most affectionate union in conscious innocence, she rather imprudently despised the malice of public opinion'.<sup>3</sup>

The letters that passed between Arbuthnot and his wife prove their devotion to each other, and make it incredible that she could have been unfaithful to him. 'It is hell upon earth to me when you are ailing,' he told her. 'There is no merit in my taking care of you, for I am only selfishly taking care of my own happiness.' Many years after her death he said that her life was passed in making him happy. 'I hope at the end of another ten years,' she wrote to him in 1824, 'you will love me as much as now; and if I am alive, I am certain I shall love you more'.<sup>4</sup> At a time when he was nursing a severe cold in London, she wrote to Lady Shelley, 'I think him so good and so great that I feel as if he ought not to have the ordinary ills of life even.'<sup>5</sup> Lady Shelley wrote to the duke after Mrs. Arbuthnot's death: 'That union of frankness and discretion which . . . made her so valuable a friend, gave you—from the experience of many years—a repose in her society which no one else could replace.'<sup>6</sup>

Arbuthnot described his fourteen years' tenure of the treasury secretary-

<sup>1</sup> Bagot, *Canning and his friends*, I. 6 n.

<sup>2</sup> *Diary of Frances, Lady Shelley, 1787-1817*, II. 310-11

<sup>3</sup> *Notes, by Sir Robert Heron*, p. 211 (2nd Ed., 1851). He added. 'Dying at forty, she had not survived her beauty. Highly accomplished, admirably well informed, particularly in all that could be learnt from the best company, utterly without affectation, her manners were fascinating and her conversation most agreeable.'

<sup>4</sup> He told Sir William Knighton in 1823 that he had everything at home to make him happy (*Letters of George IV.*, III. 46)

<sup>5</sup> *Lady Shelley's diary*, II. 178

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 253. The Duke addressed his letters, 'My dear Mrs. Arbuthnot,' and ended them with 'Ever yours most sincerely, W'. See nos. 52, 61, 64, 107, 132, 143.

ship as 'a long and bad slavery'; emancipation came in 1823. The severity of his labours, and in particular the strain of attending the house of commons debates night after night throughout the session, had injured his health (36). In 1822 he had refrained from handing in his resignation only under extreme pressure from his friend Lord Londonderry.<sup>1</sup> He now needed, he said, comparative quiet and relaxation; gout had attacked him for the first time in his life, he had no longer the strength to support the fatigues of another session so exhausting as the opposition had contrived to make the 1822 one.<sup>2</sup>

In December 1822 Lord Liverpool arranged with the king to remove Vansittart, one of the most incompetent finance ministers in modern British history, to the chancellorship of the duchy of Lancaster. Arbuthnot had long ago resolved to quit the treasury whenever there was a change in the chancellorship. 'In this feeling', he said, 'I was upheld by Lord Londonderry.'<sup>3</sup> The decision to promote Huskisson to the office of president of the board of trade seemed to afford the prime minister the opportunity of transferring Arbuthnot to the less strenuous post of first commissioner of woods and forests. Peel, however, was anxious to see his Irish friend Vesey Fitzgerald promoted to this office, and Lord Liverpool had therefore to explain why Arbuthnot's claims were to be preferred. Arbuthnot had long looked to Huskisson's office 'as a sort of retirement, but which would keep him still in those confidential relations to me, which are of the utmost importance to my comfort'.<sup>4</sup>

But the change was not to be effected without causing pain and vexation in several quarters. Wallace, the vice-president of the board of trade, took umbrage at the very thought of subordination to a man who he considered had no peculiar aptitude for the presidentship; and he at once announced his intention to resign. Lord Liverpool, an old political and Christ Church friend, who fully appreciated the great value of Wallace's work, was anxious to avert a breach by offering him the office which had been destined for Arbuthnot. Arbuthnot was asked to consider several alternatives. Would he be willing to remain at the treasury for another year until some other arrangement for him could be made? Would he take Wallace's office and work under Huskisson in the house of commons? Or would he entertain the idea of a foreign embassy, in which case Naples could probably be opened for him?

He replied that his health was then much worse than in the previous year when, with difficulty, Londonderry and the duke had dissuaded him from retiring: he could not therefore retain his present office. The offer of the Naples embassy was rejected, not without pain. He told Liverpool:<sup>5</sup>

I am sure that I shall ever take most kindly what I know to have been most kindly meant, but allow me to say that it breaks my heart to feel that while I can with honour remain in office you should find me of so little utility to yourself as to be willing that I should

<sup>1</sup> *Bathurst papers*, p. 538. For his wish to retire in 1819, see no. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Yonge's *Liverpool*, III. 209 sqq., Add. MS. 38744 (Huskisson papers), fo. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Add. MS. 38292 (Liverpool papers), fo. 158.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 40304 (Peel papers), ff. 98, 100.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 38292 (Liverpool papers), fo. 159.

be so entirely removed. I hope it will be obvious that for many other reasons<sup>1</sup> I could not go to Naples. . . . That I am quite wretched I do not deny, but I know that I am right in making myself a sacrifice for your comfort, and I only hope that the painful discussions which have taken place may not interfere with the friendship which I have long been delighted to feel has subsisted between us

He reluctantly agreed, in the end, to take Wallace's place as vice-president of the board of trade. He wrote to Lord Liverpool:<sup>2</sup>

I cannot state too strongly that the office of Vice-President is, abstractedly speaking, as high in rank as I could desire, but if I think that I am lowered by taking what Wallace refuses to keep, and if I feel that with Huskisson in the House of Commons I should be *deteriorated* in character, I at least have the comfort of knowing that in these opinions I am supported by the Duke of Wellington . . . The Duke is now gone to bed, and he has urged that I will allow him to decide for me. I am very confident that his decision will be against my being Vice-President with the President in the House of Commons. But I tell you from myself, and against the opinions of those whom I most respect, that I adhere to the consent which I gave. I hardly dare show what I have written, for I shall create pain in some quarters and be blamed in others. I bear however in mind that I have through many hard-working years had but the one thought of saving you from uneasiness or embarrassment, and of giving to you all the benefit of most zealous service. I must tell you also truly that I could now no longer have enjoyment with the Woods and Forests, when it would always be present to my mind that you had wished to have made another arrangement. Although, therefore, this last winding up of my political life has, I conceal it not, quite destroyed my peace of mind, it would, for the considerations above stated, be less unsatisfactory to be Vice-President under all the painful circumstances which I have described, than now to accept the Woods and Forests. . . . Heaven knows that it will not be in ill humour that I shall hereafter resign; but I shall feel it incumbent upon me to do so when I find that no other opening can be made for me.

But Arbuthnot was not allowed in the end to make the sacrifice for which he was prepared: he was appointed surveyor of woods and forests, and Wallace resigned (42). Arbuthnot told Huskisson on 21 January 1823:<sup>3</sup>

I really pity Lord Liverpool from the bottom of my heart, but in truth he has brought the whole upon himself by his *gaucherie*. He has wounded *you* and *me* and *Wallace*, and he contrived also at first to mortify poor Van. The only person that he has pleased is Robinson, and *he* could not fail to be well satisfied. . . . I have been in a dreadful state of mind for ten days. I am now getting better, but I am like the sea after a storm, and it will be some time before I can recover from all my agitations.

Financial difficulties were one cause of his inability to accept foreign employment. In exchanging the secretaryship of the treasury for the woods and forests he had sacrificed £2,000 a year, and, moreover, there were four grown-up children to provide for, including two unmarried daughters. His pension of £2,000 a year, given in 1807 as a reward for his diplomatic services, remained in abeyance so long as he held office under the crown, with the result that from 1823 until his retirement in 1830 he really served the public for nothing (193). In earlier years, by his own confession, he had lived somewhat extravagantly. The expenses of his various diplomatic missions had apparently more than swallowed up his salary and allowances. Sometime during the war he had been advised to invest his money in land instead of in government stock,

<sup>1</sup> 'At my time of life, and circumstanced as my family is, I could not have availed myself of such a retreat.'

<sup>2</sup> Add. MS. 38292, fo. 156.

<sup>3</sup> Add. MS. 38744 (Huskisson papers), fo. 58.

which was then considered less secure. He had therefore bought his estate at Woodford, in Northamptonshire, but at a time when prices were inflated by war finance.<sup>1</sup> The farm there, which should have yielded a satisfactory income, proved 'a great ruin' to him for some time, though, years afterwards, it turned out to be a profitable investment. He told his son Charles<sup>2</sup> in 1840:

It certainly was unwise to undertake the management and the improvement of land, when I could give no personal attention to it,<sup>3</sup> and when, moreover, I had a succession of bad bailiffs.

Other letters which might have thrown more light on his financial position whilst he was at the treasury, are wanting, but these facts indicate in general the cause of his worries, which gave him, his wife, and his intimate friends the deepest concern in 1823. How serious was his position was first revealed by the publication of the *Letters of George IV*.<sup>4</sup> Hearing of his troubles from the duke and Sir William Knighton, the keeper of the privy purse, the king came to his assistance in a most generous and handsome manner. He sent him £15,000, borrowing the money from the Rothschilds on the security of his Hanoverian revenues, and Arbuthnot was saved from the necessity of choosing between flight to the Continent to avoid his creditors and a debtor's prison (52). He wrote to Knighton, 'The King was angelic. Keep him in the feeling that he saved me from perdition.'<sup>5</sup>

This was not the only relief he obtained in this year. In January his wife was given a civil list pension of £1,200 a year (193). In November Lord Bathurst, the colonial secretary, at Wellington's request, offered him the agency of Ceylon, a sinecure which was worth about £1,200 a year gross and £1,100 net.<sup>6</sup> When, however, Huskisson, who had resigned the agency, declared that Arbuthnot's nomination might give rise to parliamentary criticism, Liverpool suggested that the office should be given to Arbuthnot's elder son, and the salary be reduced to £800. Arbuthnot must have rejected this proposal on Bathurst's advice, for we find him declining the agency altogether, saying that it was not perhaps suited to his station in public life; and, moreover, he had discovered that whenever he went out of office he would be disabled from holding the agency together with his pension, so that its importance to himself and family was much reduced (58).

<sup>1</sup> Woodford was sold about the year 1882.

<sup>2</sup> General Charles George James Arbuthnot (1801-70), page of honour to George III, 1812; ensign in the Grenadier Guards, 1816, captain in the 28th Regiment, 1820; lieutenant-colonel in the 72nd, 1825.

<sup>3</sup> Because of his absorption in official duties as secretary of the treasury (no. 193).

<sup>4</sup> *Letters of George IV*, iii. 44 sqq.

<sup>5</sup> Arbuthnot had made himself useful to George IV when he was prince of Wales. It was part of the duty of the parliamentary secretary of the treasury to manage the government newspapers. The prince's relations with his wife had exposed him to severe criticism from the press, and Arbuthnot had striven, not without success, to influence some of the journals friendly to his royal master. The fact that the princess of Wales's cause had been taken up by the opposition had made it particularly important in 1812 that the Government should secure a substantial majority at the general election, and Arbuthnot had worked hard thus indirectly to help the prince regent (*Letters of George IV*, i. 195).

<sup>6</sup> *Bathurst papers*, pp. 552-8; Melville, *Huskisson papers*, pp. 168-74.

Arbuthnot came into still closer contact with the king when he became surveyor of woods and forests, and he was able to promote George IV's extensive programme of alterations and rebuilding in St. James's Park, Buckingham House, and Windsor Castle (which proved a considerable drain on public funds and a constant source of embarrassment to the government). Liverpool was therefore justified in remarking<sup>1</sup> that the office had become one 'of peculiar delicacy from the connections which must exist between the discharge of the duties of it, and the administration of the King's private affairs. For such a situation and relation Arbuthnot is particularly qualified.'

When Canning became prime minister in April 1827 Arbuthnot resigned, in company with nearly all the anti-Catholic members of the administration. When they returned to power in January 1828, Arbuthnot, at the king's express request,<sup>2</sup> resumed his former office, but in June he was transferred to the chancellorship of the duchy of Lancaster, an office which kept him closely connected with the king's private concerns.<sup>3</sup> He was of great use to his friend the duke when the government was being formed. Wellington wrote on 18 January: <sup>4</sup>

Arbuthnot has been with me since the first day that I was charged with this commission. He has been present at every conversation I have had with friends or others. He knows all of which I have been informed, and that I have done.

But it is clear from his letter of 13 July 1828 that he was losing his peculiarly confidential position in the counsels of the party, partly for the reasons which he himself gives (107), partly because his office did not bring him into touch with the rank-and-file of the party, as the secretaryship of the treasury had done. And he was now tired of public life (134).

His official career came to an end in November 1830 when the Wellington ministry was defeated. He was advised<sup>5</sup> that his pension, which he now began to draw, disqualified him from sitting in the house of commons, an opinion which the speaker formally confirmed in January 1831, and his parliamentary career too was now closed. The loss of his official position must have been a blow to him, for he was afraid that one of the first fruits of a reformed parliament would be the confiscation of all official pensions. The thought that he was now a pensioner (a word which radical propaganda had made most loathsome and revolting) made him altogether miserable (163), but the firm attitude of the government in opposition to the extremists' demand for the cancellation of pensions already granted, was some consolation, and the parliamentary discussion of his and other pensions, the very threat of which shook his nerves badly, was eventually stifled (142). He reduced his personal expenditure to £1,200 a year ('That is the sum upon which the duke thought I might be able to live'), and out of it he met the cost of keeping Woodford in repair. He gave up his house in Carlton Gardens, which he was soon able to let at a rental of £1,200 a year, in order that he might be able to provide more

<sup>1</sup> Add. MS. 40304 (Peel papers), fo. 100.

<sup>2</sup> Parker's *Peel*, ii 30.

<sup>3</sup> Arbuthnot was not in the cabinet, though for many years the office had been considered a Cabinet one.

<sup>4</sup> *W.N.D.*, iv. 201.

<sup>5</sup> By W. G. Adam, William Adam's son.

amply for his son Charles. Woodford apparently remained mortgaged after 1823 for the rest of his life, though he left his elder son ample funds, in the shape of a substantial life insurance policy, to pay off the charge after his death.

In August 1834 came the crushing blow of his wife's sudden death. After his tragic bereavement he felt there was nothing more to live for except his children. Within a month of his wife's death he gave up Woodford to his elder son. For the rest of his life he made his home with the duke of Wellington at Apsley House, where he died in 1850, two years before his old friend.

It had been his constant preoccupation to make his children happy and comfortable financially. Writing to his son Charles in 1838, he said :

To have my four beloved children well and happy is the greatest blessing I can have, and to leave them in prosperity will be the comfort of my dying moments. No father had better children, if so good. No children were ever more loved by a father than you are by me.<sup>1</sup>

With a restraint rare among early nineteenth-century politicians, whigs as well as tories (we know how well Lord Grey provided for a host of relations after November 1830), Arbuthnot made no use of his great influence with Lord Liverpool to promote the fortunes of his family at the public expense. He asked for nothing for himself (his pension was unsolicited) and practically nothing for his relations. He afterwards wrote :

With the exception of recommending for preferment a brother in the Church, and asking for a clerkship in the Treasury for a nephew, I never endeavoured, nor ever did obtain, one single favour for myself or for my family during the many years that the whole patronage of the Treasury, far different then from what it is now, passed, as I may truly say, through my hands. I have at least the consolation of knowing that I did not grasp at favours when I might have had them, and that I never betrayed the unlimited confidence which was placed in me.

Arbuthnot kept up an extensive correspondence with his family and most of the Tory statesmen and politicians of his time, but, like most nineteenth-century collections of papers, this one has considerable gaps. There is a fair quantity of family correspondence before 1812, but, apart from official papers relating to his Constantinople embassy, which is doubtless duplicated in the Public Record Office, there is not much of political interest or importance up to that date. Some letters including Arbuthnot's long biographical sketch, lent by the family to Mrs. P. S. M. Arbuthnot, author of *Memories of the Arbuthnots of Kincardineshire and Aberdeenshire* (London, 1920), were apparently not returned : at any rate, they are now missing. Upon quitting office Arbuthnot doubtless destroyed a mass of private or semi-official papers relating to his duties as patronage secretary of the treasury : it was not then, nor is it now, the custom to preserve such confidential documents. The greater part of Wellington's letters to Arbuthnot and his wife Harriet are missing. Immedi-

<sup>1</sup> On another occasion he assured his son 'Never father had a better son, and you are the comfort of my life. . . . I have to thank God every hour of my life for having given me such children. The coming on of old age is no cause of lamentation to me, for I feel that I live again in the prosperity of my children.'

ately after Arbuthnot's death the duke asked General Arbuthnot to allow him to see these letters, promising to return them. The Duke, however, died with them still in his possession, and without leaving instructions for their return. It appears from the *Memories of the Arbuthnots* mentioned above that the family repeatedly but unsuccessfully asked for the return of this correspondence. There is reason to believe that much of it has been destroyed.

Only a small number of letters from this collection of manuscripts has already been published. C. S. Parker, in his *Sir Robert Peel, from his private papers* (1891-9), and his *Life and letters of Sir James Graham* (1907), quoted a few letters from Peel and Graham. All the important letters dated February to July 1827 were printed in my *Formation of Canning's Ministry* (Royal Historical Society, Camden Series, 3rd ser., lix. 1938), and a few excerpts from nos. 45 and 46, in the present volume, were cited in my article, 'George IV and Sir William Knighton' (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, January 1940, pp. 57-82). Mention has already been made of the letters quoted in Mrs. P. S. M. Arbuthnot's *Memories of the Arbuthnots of Kincardineshire and Aberdeenshire*.

This volume has been produced under considerable difficulties. The shortage of paper is responsible for the omission of place-names from the index, and the combination of letters addressed to one individual by the same writer. In normal circumstances the notes would have been somewhat fuller, but wherever possible, every person mentioned in the text is identified, if not in a footnote, in the Index. The original spelling of the letters has been retained, though capitals and paragraphs have been modernized or altered. A few letters with newspaper references will be quoted in a work on the government and the press on which I am now engaged.

I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to the President of the Society for the constant help and advice which he has given me during the preparation of this volume. To Mr. A. V. Judges, Joint Literary Director of the Society, I am grateful for assistance in seeing the book through the press.

# THE CORRESPONDENCE OF CHARLES ARBUTHNOT

## 1. Charles Arbuthnot to Unknown Correspondent.

*Cholmondeley Castle, 11 October 1808.*—The day before yesterday I received your letter of the 10th inst. & I confess to you that it was not without shame that I saw your handwriting. Indeed, I shd. have been still more ashamed, if I had not been conscious that I have not intentionally been so very inattentive to you as I have appeared ; & if there were not reasons for my silence, wch. wd., I trust in part, excuse it. The truth is, that there is now at my own house a part of a letter wch. I had begun to write to you ; but which I was at the time prevented from finishing by the unexpected occurrence of a very fatiguing & constantly pressing business.

I must own to you likewise that the questions you had put to me united in rendering it difficult to send you the letter which I had intended. You wished to have information in respect to Turkish politics ; & tho' it wd. be highly gratifying to me if I could flatter myself that any notions of mine could do you service, yet really I thought it necessary to consider & to pause before I could venture to hazard speculations on such a subject. You would, no doubt, be anxious to learn from me whether the present state of the Ottoman Empire ought to lead one to expect its approaching downfall ; or whether from my observations I should be inclined to imagine that even with its evident inertness, it still has sufficient strength to hold for a time together. When I inform you that our nearly two last [*sic*] Embassadors in Spain, Lords Auckland & St. Helens, had seen nothing in the Spanish character wch. can lead them to account for the burst of patriotism wch. we have witnessed, & for the hitherto successful opposition to France, it will not astonish you that I cannot undertake to predict what is likely to happen in the country which I have recently quitted. I will tell you, however, what I heard of Turkey & of the inhabitants whilst I remained among them ; but as I have only the means of giving you very scanty & imperfect information, I must beg you to bear in mind that I did not reside at Pera two full years ; & that during the time I was there, my mind was rendered inactive & at last broken down by the severest domestic affliction.



The Turkish Government is so perfectly disjointed that the Governors, or Pachas, of the different Provinces, so far from holding friendly intercourse with each other, are, upon their own authority & for their own objects, not unfrequently in a state of open war ; and indeed they never agree in anything except in one uniform resistance to the orders of the Porte. This state of things prevails so generally & to such an extent, that I do not hesitate in declaring that beyond the walls of Constantinople, the Grand Signior has not more power than you or I have.

It will obviously occur to you that an Empire so constituted could offer but little opposition to any invading army ; & you will be no less inclined to suppose that among Pachas so jealous of each other, it would be the easiest of all things to obtain by treachery all that was not to be attempted by force of arms. And such would necessarily be the result if it could be made evident to the different independent Princes (for such are the Pachas) that they would be gainers by the change ; but hitherto, in all wars, they have always felt that no foreign Power could bribe them into so splendid a situation as that wch. they now possess. This has been the cause of the invariably steady resistance to the Austrian armies ; while the resistance to the Russians not having been produced by the same motives, there has throughout Europe been a general tho' erroneous idea that the Court of Petersburg had been acting with a vigor which could not be ascribed to that of Vienna. That part of the Turkish Empire wch. adjoins to Austria is inhabited by a warlike & hardy race of men, & inspirited as they are by a fanatic devotion to their religion, their chiefs, acting in unison for that object & that object alone, have had no difficulty in preventing the Austrian armies from advancing far into a country where there are no roads, where provisions are very scarce, & where the defiles, even without opposition, would be almost impassable.

The Russians, on the contrary, have the Moldavians & Walachians for their neighbours, & these are not only proverbially the most timid of men, but, as professors of the Greek religion, they are naturally the secret enemies of the Porte, though still its subjects. Those two Provinces, open on all sides & throughout easy of access, have of course been immediately overrun ; & the conquest of them has, moreover, been facilitated by the nature of the Turkish armies which the Russians have had to combat. As no reliance could be placed by the Porte on the Moldavians & the Walachians, it has been found necessary to attempt the defence of the Provinces which they inhabit by transporting into them armies of real Turks. But those armies were only to be procured by assembling into one mass the quotas of men which the Pachas in Asia have been willing to furnish ; & which men being the most lawless, the worst disciplined, & the least warlike of all the Grand Signior's subjects, & being in addition always anxious to return to their own homes with the plunder they may have amassed, it is easily to be understood that the celebrated victories of the Russians might be cheaply purchased. It is likewise to be recollected that when the Russians, having crossed the Danube, came to be opposed to Turks who belonged to the Provinces which they had to defend, they then uniformly met with a resistance wch. oftentimes obliged them to

recross the river, or else, by checking their progress, produced in general a desire for peace.

It has been with a view to give some general idea of the means of defence which the Turks possess, that I have endeavoured to explain the cause of that very different fortune which the Courts of Petersburg & Vienna, in their Turkish wars, have usually met with. I have not presumed to say whether French armies might be able to make a successful invasion, & thereby produce the long looked-for overthrow of the Ottoman Empire; but I have thought it right to attempt to prove to you that, barbarous & grossly ignorant as the Turks still are, there are reasons for expecting that the bravest & best disciplined armies might fail, if they entangled themselves in a country where it is possible that modern tactics might afford no resource. And I ought to add that the experience of this last Russian war has not contradicted the events of former ones. It will have been obvious even from the newspaper accounts that the Russians obtained no advantages over the Turks; & I have since happened to learn from a person who was my Consul at Bouccarest, & who, during the whole war, was at the Russian Headquarters, that there was scarcely any action between the two armies in which the Turks were not victorious. They are, indeed, when acting separately or in small bodies, as brave and as likely to be successful as any troops whatever; & if our hopes for Spain are chiefly to depend upon the inaccessible nature of the country, there would, I think, as things now are, be still greater reason to expect that for the conquest and overthrow of Turkey more than human means would be required.

The Turks, it is true, are ignorant in the extreme, & in the military art in particular—as far at least as it depends on science—they have not kept pace with any of their neighbours; but on the other hand they have, as I have already observed, a country to defend, which, even [if] left to itself, must from the nature of it impede the progress of all large bodies of men; it is the evident policy of all their chiefs to unite, for the preservation of their own power & independence, against every invading enemy; and more than all, they have a religion to protect wch. inflames them against those whom they consider as wicked unbelievers.

Although you did not specify, when you made enquiries respecting Turkish politics, what was the particular information wch. you wished to obtain, yet I take for granted that you were anxious to learn to which of the Powers of Europe the Porte is at present the best disposed. If that were the object of yr. enquiry I believe I might satisfy you in a few words.

In former times, & before the invasion of Egypt by Buonaparte's army, the French were the people who, beyond all comparison, were the most liked, respected, & considered. The English till that period were but little known & less thought of; but our victories over the French naturally raised us in the estimation of the Turks, tho' at the same time they in some degree caused them to be jealous of us. It certainly mortified the Ottoman pride to be under the necessity of recovering Egypt by efforts not their own; and as you will remember that that country was not evacuated by us so soon as had

been at first expected, & as, while we remained there, we kept up a suspicious intimacy with the Beys, it was not perhaps unnatural for the Porte to be apprehensive that we might become as dangerous as the first invaders. Indeed I had reason to perceive, during the whole of my Embassy, that that jealousy, thus excited, had never quite subsided ; but, however, we were still able to maintain the superiority of our influence, and I believe I may venture to say that notwithstanding the battles of Austerlitz & of Jena, we might have continued to maintain it, if it had not then been unfortunately the necessary policy of our Court to alienate & disgust the Turks by our unreserved support of Russia.

I have thought that our influence was to be maintained—even in spite of all Buonaparte's decisive victories—for at that very time I prevailed upon the Porte to reinstate the Hospodars wch. had been disgraced at the avowed instigation of the French Ambassador ; & if afterwards it had been possible for me to confine myself to British objects alone, I can have no doubt that at this moment there would be a British Embassy in Turkey.

But the Russians will always continue to be the abhorred enemies of the Turks ; and reluctantly (as I must in fairness say) these last were at length obliged to abandon us, & to prefer a connection with France as being the only Power which would be willing to support them against Russia.

Whether the Porte, now that we ourselves are at war with Russia, would consent to end a war which to neither of us has any longer any object, is a question that at this distance could not be easily decided. The Turks, I am confident, have no wish to be in hostilities with us ; but the French Ambassador must have great means for preserving the influence which he had acquired ; & although it is generally supposed that a kind of invitation to negotiate peace has come to us from Constantinople, yet in my opinion it is far from certain that any Minister of ours could at present be received.<sup>1</sup> I am not fond of hazarding opinions of this nature ; but it certainly did happen that some weeks ago, when this subject was mentioned in my presence, I expressed a doubt of our being able to succeed in such a negotiation, & I particularly said that a new revolution at Constantinople might perhaps remove the Ministers who might have wished for peace with England. Almost immediately afterwards the news was received of the revolution wch. has taken place ; but I must own myself to you not sufficiently well informed to be able to decide whether the French have been the immediate authors of that revolution.<sup>2</sup>

We only know that the party at Constantinople which has lately fallen had evinced an anxiety to be at peace with us ; & that party must consequently have become obnoxious to the French interest.

In speaking of the Powers which of late years have acted a leading part at Constantinople, I have abstained from making any reference whatever to the Austrians. I have done so because, tho' the immediate & the powerful

<sup>1</sup> Diplomatic relations between Great Britain and Turkey were suspended, 1807-8.

<sup>2</sup> In June 1807 the sultan, Selim, had been deposed in favour of his nephew, Mustapha, who reigned only until the following May. Six months later there was a third revolution, but Mahmud saved his throne by sacrificing his ministers.

neighbours of Turkey, they have never since the days of Prince Eugene been in the least dreaded by the Porte ; & of late years since their reverses in their wars with revolutionary France, they have been held in such little estimation by the Ottoman Ministers that there was not a single mission at Pera which did not seem to possess an equal influence.

England—France—and Russia were in my time the only Powers that were ever thought of or considered ; & I shd. expect to find that the defeats & subsequent disgrace of Russia had now caused her to be as much despised in Turkey as she used to be abhorred and feared.

I have now endeavoured to meet yr. wishes by acquainting you with the result of the general observations I made during my short residence in Turkey. In the early part of my letter I prepared you for very inaccurate and incomplete information ; & having stated that wch. I had to give in a very hasty & unmethodized manner, I shd. really be unwilling to transmit such a writing to you, if I had not earnestly the desire to prove that my long silence has not proceeded from inattention to yr. wishes.

Perhaps what I send may at least enable you to put further questions to me in a more direct & specific shape ; & I beg you to be assured that I shall at all times have great pleasure in giving or procuring for you all the information in my power.

In regard to the paper on the Wahabees you are perfectly at liberty to make all the use of it which you may desire. I have only to request that it may not be mentioned as having been received from me ; for tho' in publishing it myself I shd. not be the betrayer of State secrets, yet I feel that I have no right to allow myself to be quoted for such information as my public situation had procured for me. Were it not for this circumstance, I shd. have been highly flattered at the idea of seeing my name in such a valuable work as yours.

I shall be most anxious to see the new edition of your last work, for I shd. imagine that the wonderful events we witness cannot be unnoticed by you ; & in particular I shd. be desirous to know your thoughts, as connected with the prophecies, upon what is so unexpectedly now happening in Spain. I shall be very glad to learn whether you have been so astonished by it as I am. . . .

## 2. The Marquess Wellesley to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Seville, 30 October 1809. Private.*—I received your letter of the 5th October by Sydenham<sup>1</sup> with the most sincere sentiments of gratitude & friendship. You will know that I concur in your opinions by my acceptance of the seals of the Foreign Office ; and I believe it will be unnecessary to add my determination to employ every effort in the public service. It is impossible to succeed to the full extent of my wishes in the present state of the world ;

<sup>1</sup> A member of the Wellesley 'connexion'. Whilst Wellesley was governor-general of Bengal, Sydenham was his military secretary.

but it is not very unreasonable to expect at least as much success as has attended either of the Administrations which England has seen since she lost Mr. Pitt

One loss would grieve me deeply, that of Mr. Huskisson.<sup>1</sup> I entertain the greatest regard & esteem for his character, and the highest respect for his talents & attainments; in any view which I have ever formed of acting in the King's Councils, I have always looked to him as a main source of assistance. From me he would ever meet with the most cordial confidence and goodwill. I hope he will not quit the King on this occasion, nor lose the opportunity of aiding us in the correction of many errors. You are at liberty to state my sentiments to him. If I could venture to use such a freedom I should have written to him.

P.S. I am in the utmost anxiety to bring my eldest son, Richard Wellesley, into Parliament without delay. I think he will prove an invaluable acquisition; perhaps a great bulwark against our *new* enemy. I wish you to urge this point in the most strenuous manner, so that it may be done as soon as possible. It is really a point of the greatest importance in my estimation. Even if he were not my relation, but a mere partizan, I should be most eager for his introduction into Parliament.<sup>2</sup>

### 3. Viscount Wellington to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Elvas, 28 May 1811.*— . . . I am glad that you are pleased with the result of the campaign in Portugal, and I hope that we shall continue to get on prosperously. But people in England must not be in too great a hurry. They must give us time to do things by degrees, and I hope I shall be able to perform them without great loss; which after all our boasting we cannot well bear. If there is a war in the north I think we shall make Boney's situation in Spain this year not a *bed of roses*; if there is not a war in the north this year, it is impossible that his fraudulent & disgusting tyranny can be endured much longer; & if Great Britain can only hold out I think we shall yet bring the affairs of the Peninsula to a satisfactory termination.

I don't know what to say to Lord Sidmouth's party being added to the Govt. It has always appeared to me that it was desirable that this Govt. should be strengthened by the addition of one or more of the floating parties in the House of Commons.<sup>3</sup> I am not certain that the party of Lord Sidmouth, although numerically the strongest, is not the least desirable to have, as it is the most unpopular in the country, & not liked by many who now compose the Govt. However, if the Govt. is to last, something of the kind must be done to strengthen it; and it is better to begin with Lord Sidmouth than to do nothing.

<sup>1</sup> Huskisson resigned his office of joint-secretary of the treasury when Canning retired from the Government

<sup>2</sup> Richard Wellesley was returned for Queenborough on 1 June 1810

<sup>3</sup> The groups led by Sidmouth and Canning were the principal 'floating parties' in 1811. Castlereagh too, who was out of office until 1812, had a small following.

My own opinion is, however, that if the King should not recover entirely very soon, the Govt. can't last; indeed, they must resign their situations if they should continue to enjoy only the nominal confidence of the Regent, & if the MacMahon<sup>1</sup> Cabinet should continue to exist.

#### 4. Sir Henry Wellesley<sup>2</sup> to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Cádiz, 5 July 1812. Private*—Many thanks to you for your letter of the 16th June, which has given me a little insight into the extraordinary proceedings at home—I cannot think the Ministers justifiable in their conduct to Lord Wellesley, nor should anything induce me to remain here after the treatment he has met with at their hands, were I not apprehensive that my sudden resignation might be attended with inconvenience both to the public service & to Lord Wellington personally. I cannot imagine that Lord Wellington will not feel upon this subject exactly as I do, though it may be still more difficult if not impossible for him to act upon his feelings.

It is stated in the newspaper that you are to be Secretary in Ireland, although you do not mention it in your letter. I shall be very happy to hear this change confirmed by yourself.

We are going on here tout bien que mal, & in anxious expectation of news from Lord Wellington who, I hope, will give Marmont a dressing. We are bombarded every night but without much effect. I see no prospect, however, of the blockade being soon raised.<sup>3</sup> . . .

#### 5. George Canning to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Gloucester Lodge, Saturday, 18 July 1812*—I am most sincerely obliged to you for your letter. I do assure you (what perhaps in most cases is not a matter that requires much assurance) that I am sincerely desirous of coming into the Regent's service, & that I should consider a re-union with Liverpool in office as an object the most desirable, publicly & privately. But the price to be paid on coming in would cost me a bitter pang—not from any personal feeling towards C[astlereagh] upon my honour, but from a sense of humiliation—hard to endure, & I *think* unnecessary to be proposed to me<sup>4</sup> I have not demanded the lead for myself. It is not my fault that such a thing as lead has been known or named in these discussions. I should be

<sup>1</sup> Colonel McMahon was the prince regent's private secretary.

<sup>2</sup> British Minister (1810–11) and ambassador (1811–21) to Spain. He resided at Cadiz during the French occupation of the Peninsula. His brother, Lord Wellesley, had resigned the foreign secretaryship in February 1812, and in May, following the assassination of Perceval, the ministers refused to become members of a Government to be formed by Wellesley.

<sup>3</sup> The French retreated from Cadiz at the end of August upon hearing of the capture of Madrid.

<sup>4</sup> Canning's ill-judged refusal of the foreign secretaryship on the ground that his rival, Castlereagh, was to retain the lead in the commons, kept him out of office until 1816.

contented if it could be put in abeyance as between C. & me—as it would be if continuing nominally with the Chancp. of the Ex. in a third hand—even in Van.'s. Why not? He can live in the house—write the letters<sup>1</sup>—give the dinner, & read the Speech<sup>2</sup>—and C. & I could assist him in the House, doing the business of our respective Departments.

As to Department—I need not tell you that my offer to take the Chancp. of the Ex. was really what it professed to be, an attempt at solving a difficulty. I need not tell you that the Foreign Office is the only one for which in point of taste & liking I have a decided preference—that as to office therefore I am perfectly contented. Could C. be prevailed upon to take the Home Department? With Ireland & the Catholics on the one hand, & the present state of the interior of the country on the other—it is most important—it is *first* in rank of Secs. of State—& this arrangement would *silently* remove another obstacle in Ld. S. to which I have not pressed any objection—lest my motives should be mistaken, but which must be insuperable, on acct. of appearance & impression in Ireland. Much rather had I, however, that it was removed without any objection of mine; & merely as matter of arrangement.

You will judge by the openness with which I have written to you that I take your letter exactly in the spirit in which it is intended. If you should have anything that you wished to say to me, I shall be at Huskisson's from about 12 to near one.

[P.S.] I *must* press Pole for Cabinet.<sup>3</sup> But Sec. at War I should think would do—or Mint. When a Cabinet is 14 (as all must stay I find) the 15th makes no great difference.

## 6. Sir Henry Wellesley to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Cadiz, 20 September 1812. Private.*—I cannot help feeling a great deal disappointed at seeing Mr. Peel's name in the newspapers as Secretary for Ireland, as, from all I had heard, I was in hopes that you were going there. Pray tell me about this, and whether you remain at the Treasury from choice—your services would surely entitle you to a removal if you wished it.

You must all be rejoiced at Lord Wellington's successes, which are certainly wonderful. The Cortes have just appointed him Commander-in-Chief of the Spanish Armies, which I consider as the most important event which has yet happened, and what renders it still more satisfactory is, that it was entirely voluntary on their part. I trust no objection will be made to it in England or by Lord Wellington, although I am a little apprehensive of both. I have no doubt that sufficient powers will be given to him to give full effect to the appt.

<sup>1</sup> The circular letters to members of the house of commons.

<sup>2</sup> The speech which was to be delivered from the throne at the opening of the parliamentary session was read the previous evening at a grand parliamentary dinner given by the leader of the house of commons to his principal colleagues and supporters.

<sup>3</sup> Wellesley-Pole, one of Lord Wellesley's brothers, belonged to the Wellesley party which was at this time co-operating with Canning's. He entered the cabinet as master of the mint in September 1814.

I go on here much as usual. With respect to public business I naturally feel less confidence in myself, & act with less than I did when Lord W[ellesley] was in office, and (between ourselves) I do not believe that our Minister for Foreign Affairs has the same confidence in me that he, Ld. W., had. I shall not, however, abandon the cause so long as I think I can be useful. I am nevertheless anxious to obtain a discretionary leave of absence for two or three months to enable me to be in England for three weeks or a month. I should not make use of this at any moment when my presence here could be of importance, but now that the siege of Cadiz is raised and the army in the hands of Lord Wellington, I do not think that my absence for a short time would be material. If you are intimate with Lord C[astlereagh] perhaps you could sound him upon this.<sup>1</sup>

If you are still at the Treasury you could do me a great service if you would occasionally inquire as to the payment of my accounts. My expences in the present state of Spain are necessarily enormous. They have hitherto been regularly paid, & I suppose will continue to be so; if not, I must go. One fourth of the expence which appears in England arises from the state of the exchange, which is 23 per cent against the drawer of a bill. . . .

### 7. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Coombe Wood, 14 July 1817. Private.*—I can have no objection to McMahon being created a baronet with the proposed reversion, but I shall be put under the greatest difficulties if it is to be done *now*. The Prince as well as myself are under positive engagements to several persons, some of whose claims are irresistible, and if McMahon is made, there must be a batch. I feel the strongest *political* objections to such a measure at present, and indeed all my colleagues do the same. If it was of any real advantage to McMahon I should be sorry for the difficulty, but by being a Privy Counsellor he is *higher* in rank already, and I am confident no person can think him neglected by his not having this particular honour confer'd upon him at present. I wish you would use your best endeavours to satisfy McMahon and the Regent on this head. At all events it cannot be done in the Gazette of tomorrow, or until I have seen his Royal Highness. I shall be in town tomorrow morning.

I am most anxious on several accounts to postpone the making any baronets till just before a dissolution of Parliament. I will explain to you the reasons when we meet.

*Enclosed:* Colonel McMahon's confidential memorandum for 'my friend Bloomfield.'<sup>2</sup>

That he would opportunely submit to him I love and adore, our gracious Master, what a consummation of happiness would crown the concluding scene of present events, if in his generosity and magnanimity, he would mark my

<sup>1</sup> He did not go on leave until August 1815

<sup>2</sup> Sir Benjamin Bloomfield had just succeeded McMahon as keeper of the privy purse and private secretary to the prince regent.



departure by a public distinction of his favor, (as the world is so prone to the malicious [*sic*]) and honor me in my own person, with the rank of Baronet, giving it in reversion to my brother, Colonel Thos. McMahon, now Aid-de-Camp to his Royal Highness, and Adjutant-General to the King's Forces in India : for, as the possession of that rank by my younger brother, the Master of the Rolls in Ireland,<sup>1</sup> was generously bestowed on him for the high legal office he holds, and his consequent conduct in that office, I view it to have no reference whatever to me, and that honor to myself at this moment would not only be peculiarly distinguishing, but a bountiful finish to his Royal Highness's benevolence.

The same Gazette to announce this promotion that announces the retirement & in following paragraphs.

### 8. The Earl of Liverpool\* to Sir John McMahon.

*Fife House, 28 August 1817. Private.*—I have received the favor of your letter of the 24th inst. on the subject of a peerage of the United Kingdom.

I am sure you will do me the justice to believe that it would give me the most sincere personal satisfaction to be enabled to meet your wishes in any object that you had much at heart—but it would be impossible for me to further the views you now entertain, consistently with the rules which I have been under the necessity of adopting, with the approbation of the Prince Regent, respecting the dispensation of honors of the nature in question, and without the most serious embarrassment to the Prince Regent's Government.<sup>2</sup>

In abstaining from creating peers, except under very special circumstances, the Prince Regent has been obliged to make considerable personal sacrifices, & to subject himself to some inconvenience. And I am confident that this distinction cannot be wanting as a mark of the sense entertained both by the Prince Regent and by his Government of your services towards his Royal Highness.

Whatever degree of value may be attached to the honor of the baronetage which the Prince Regent has conferred upon you, the manner in which it has been granted has enabled his Royal Highness to record in the Gazette of the country his sentiment of your services in a more special & particular way than I ever recollect to have been done in the instance of a favor conferred on any subject.

\* Letters marked with an asterisk are in the handwriting of Liverpool's private secretary, Robert Willmott.

<sup>1</sup> Sir William McMahon became master of the rolls in Ireland, and a baronet, in 1814. Colonel McMahon's wishes in respect to the baronetcy and a remainder were gratified.

<sup>2</sup> Writing in July 1818, Liverpool spoke of 'the inconvenience which has already arisen from the great augmentations of the numbers of the House of Lords in the course of the last fifty years', and which had 'induced H.R.H. and the Government to abstain as far as possible from adding to the numbers except in cases of engagements long since made in the name of the King's Government or of H.R.H., or when the recent services of the individual, or other important political considerations, appeared to render a departure from this rule necessary'. (B.M. Add. MS. 38272 [Liverpool Papers], fo. 282.)

## 9. The Earl of Liverpool \* to Sir John McMahon.

*Fife House, 2 September 1817. Private.*—Your answer to my letter was transmitted to me at Coombe yesterday evening. I have had so much satisfaction on several occasions in being able to comply with your personal wishes that it cannot but be extremely painful to me to be compelled to write to you in a different sense—but I can assure you most sincerely that it is not from want of any personal respect or kindness to yourself, nor certainly from any disposition to undervalue the services you have rendered the Prince Regent and his Government, that I am obliged to repeat that I cannot hold out to you expectations of an object which I know there would be so many difficulties afterwards in carrying into effect.<sup>1</sup>

## 10. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Walmer Castle, 22 October 1817. Private.*—I have received your letter by the post this morning, & lose no time in enabling you to converse with Sir Wm. Knighton upon the subject of it. I think it quite fair that the same eventual provision should be made for Lady Bloomfield as was made for Mr[?] McMahon. With respect to the pension to Bloomfield himself, it stands upon difficult grounds. I do not recollect what his appointments are as Private Secretary, nor can I understand how he is a loser by the change in his situation. This may however be true, & it may be necessary to endeavour to make the arrangement suggested, but there are difficulties not only arising out of the state of the fund but out of the *magnitude* of the pension, which would swallow up the means of providing for cases of absolute distress, and would at the same [time] attract particular notice in Parliament, if the list of pensions granted should be called for.

Another difficulty arises out of the intended arrangement for Sir Sidney Smith. You must mention this as a new difficulty to Vansittart before he commits himself to Capt. Arabin or to anyone. The result seems to be that I am not yet sufficiently informed to be able to say anything definitive, & that nothing can be done till I return to town.

You may as well say to Sir Wm. Knighton that you know how well I am disposed to Sir B. Bloomfield, that I feel strongly that some eventual provision for Lady Bloomfield is quite reasonable, that I will see how matters can be arranged when I come to town, but that the state of our funds at present create[s] considerable difficulties, & may render some delay unavoidable; that he may assure the Regent of my good disposition to effectuate what he wishes, & that *we* will consider the business thoroughly when *we* meet in town about the end of Novr. This will, I hope, satisfy for the present and give us a little time. . . .<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Liverpool wrote to him again, on the 7th [see *George IV corresp.*, ii. 199–200]. He died a few days later.

<sup>2</sup> For Lady Bloomfield's sinecure office of ranger of Hampton Park, see *George IV Corresp.*, iii. 447.

## 11. Matthew John Tierney to the Prince Regent.

15 *July* 1818.—With great humility, sincere & ardent attachment & devotion, I presume to lay myself at your Royal Highness's feet. The proud ambition of my life has been fully gratified by the honour & happiness of being physician to the greatest of Princes & the best of masters. For the last four years I have enjoyed the delight & glory of finding my humble services graciously accepted by my Prince: & for twelve years I have been employed in your Royal Highness's family, during which, I have paid more than ten thousand professional visits. My happiness is so dependant on your Royal Highness' gracious notice of me, & I feel so fully & honestly, how far such has surpassed any merit of mine, that, knowing well your princely liberality on all occasions, the idea of any other remuneration never mixed itself with my devotion to your Royal Highness' person. I should not now have presumed to make this statement to your Royal Highness, had I not seven nephews & four nieces to support & educate at an expense exceeding eleven hundred pounds per annum, & this I have done for some years past—thus situated I hope for your Royal Highness' forgiveness in thus addressing & submitting myself to your Royal Highness' gracious consideration.<sup>1</sup>

## 12. Viscount Castlereagh to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Brussels*, 28 *November* 1818. *Private*.—We have closed our proceedings, and I think well, at Aix-la-Chapelle, and are now on our way to Paris, where I shall be detain'd for some days by business, and shall probably run so close to the day on which the Chambers are to assemble, viz. the 10th, as to be induced to stay for that event. This will bring me home about the 15th of next month, which gives us full time for parliamentary arrangements, but as the circulars<sup>2</sup> should not be later in issuing than that period, I trouble you now with a formula, and shall be obliged to you to have the whole ready for being launched upon my arrival.

I have been passing two months of mere labour at Aix-la-Chapelle, there being no sort of amusement. We have done more business than in double the time at any of our former reunions, and all are gone home in good humour and vowing eternal peace and friendship, so that we shall be enabled to make our reductions with a good conscience.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Tierney wrote to Bloomfield on the 25th: 'In considering the matter with which I have tormented you, it seems likely to save time & trouble if Mr. Long, Mr. Harrison & you should talk the business over & fix any remuneration you may think right, for past as well as future services, before it be put into Lord Liverpool's hands. You know my feelings of attachmt. & devotion to our best of masters. God knows, nothing but the sense of duty I owe to many dependants would have induced me to touch upon the subject in any shape, but now I think something should be done, & done soon. In liberal hands such as those I have named, my interest, & what is dearer to me, my feelings, will be safe. Whatever the result may be I must always feel how much I am your debtor.' Dr. Tierney was created a baronet in October.

<sup>2</sup> The circular letters for attendance to members of the house of commons

<sup>3</sup> The Speech from the throne on 21 January 1819 announced that the state of Europe enabled the government to cut down the army and navy.

If Mrs A[rbuthnot] had come to Aix, she would have had the whole of Europe at her feet. There never was such a dearth known of female society. Madme. Lieven reign'd with absolute sway. I conclude, however, you were both better employ'd, growing young in the freshness of the farm,<sup>1</sup> instead of wasting your bloom upon *us old diplomats*.

The country about here is beautiful, and as we had our horses and fine weather, we did very well.

The poor Queen<sup>2</sup> has been most considerate towards us in the moment of her death. It would have been too hard to have pass'd reeking from the Congress into the House of Commons.

By the bye, I have an offer from Mr Brownlow, member for the County of Armagh, to move the Address. As he is a young man of promising talents and perfect independence, I do not think we could do better.<sup>3</sup>

Send me a line to Paris, if I can do anything for you or Mrs A., to whom I beg to be particularly remember'd.

### 13. Charles Arbuthnot to Viscount Castlereagh.

*Downing Street, Sunday, 14 March [1819]. Private.*—Had anything occurred during the week which it had been necessary for you to be acquainted with immediately, my writing to you would not have been delayed. It certainly has been my intention to write to you from day to day, but as there was nothing very pressing to mention, & as this last has been a most busy week, being in the House till one or two o'clock every morning, I thought I might wait till Saturday or Sunday before I gave you a long letter of details.<sup>4</sup>

I will first begin with Wyndham Quin's investigation, which I very much lament to say has taken a much less favourable appearance since I wrote to you my short note of yesterday.<sup>5</sup> Mr. Carew Smith, who is the principal witness against Quin, & is a near relation of the Gradys, gave a very clear evidence during two successive nights; but some of the main parts of his evidence were contradicted most positively by Mr. Goold, who, as you know, is a barrister of great eminence, & upon whom Quin relied chiefly, they being intimate friends & near relations. It was asserted by Mr. Carew Smith

<sup>1</sup> On their estate at Woodford, near Kettering.

<sup>2</sup> Queen Charlotte, wife of George III, died on the 17th.

<sup>3</sup> Brownlow did move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne

<sup>4</sup> The death of his sister, Lady Ellenborough, prevented Castlereagh from attending to his parliamentary duties during the week beginning 7 March.

<sup>5</sup> It was alleged that the Hon Windham Quin, tory M.P. for Limerick County, who had been appointed *custos rotulorum* for the county in July 1818, had, shortly afterwards, announced his intention of removing Thomas William Grady from his £800 a year office of clerk of the peace, and of appointing Richard Smith, of Limerick, in his place. Grady, however, was to be allowed a pension of £200 a year from the emoluments of the office, on condition that he supported Quin at the Limerick County elections, with his own vote and those of his hundred tenants, who were registered freeholders. Carew Smith and Goold were the lawyers representing Grady and Quin respectively. See *Parl. Deb.*, xxxix, *passim*. It was made a party question, and on 29 March the house acquitted Quin of corrupt motives in offering the pension, by 162 to 73, and, in another vote, by 154 to 81.

that at 11 in the morning of the 22nd Sept. he received a visit both from Mr. Goold & from Mr. Quin, & that their visit was repeated at 3 on the same day. Mr. Goold on the other hand declared upon his word of honour, & repeated the declaration a dozen times, I shd. think, that he had never paid in his whole life but one single visit to Mr. C. Smith, and that the visit was not in the morning but in the afternoon. In consequence of this positive contradiction, it was resolved on Friday night that the servants of the two witnesses shd. be brought from Ireland in order to ascertain if possible which of the two had given true evidence.

Just after I had written my note to you yesterday afternoon I met Mr. J. Smith (the banker) & Mr. Carew Smith. With neither of them was I acquainted, but I perceived that the former wanted to speak to me. He came up in a flurry, & saying that he believed I was in the House the night before, & that it might be satisfactory to me to read a letter which Mr. Carew Smith had just received from Mr. Wyndham Quin. The letter stated that in consequence of having taxed his memory, he had since recollected that Mr. Goold did accompany him to Mr. Carew Smith's in the morning as well as in the afternoon, & that he shd. take the very earliest moment of making a communication to this effect to the House. In every respect this great error in Mr. Goold's evidence will be injurious to Wyndham Quin. It invalidates the whole of Mr. Goold's testimony; & it was chiefly upon his testimony that Quin had to rely for a refutation of the charge of having attempted to bind the Gradys by a political compact. My conviction still is that the Gradys are infamous conspirators; but it rested very much with Mr. Goold to prove this, & it is not now to be expected that the House will rely upon the evidence of a person whose recollections have been falsified by Quin himself.

At the Speaker's last night I saw Wm. Courtenay, & I learnt from him that as soon as Quin had felt it necessary to write to Mr. Carew Smith, it had been determined that Mr. Goold should see Mr. Grattan, with whom he appears to be well acquainted. Mr. Grattan was most kind to him, and took [him] to Tierney. I think that Tierney appears to have been as cunning, I would say, & as little satisfactory as possible. He merely said to Mr. Goold that he did not suspect him of having intentionally given false evidence; but that his own impressions with regard to Quin's conduct in the transaction had throughout been very unfavourable, & that if he had abstained from asking questions it had been from a fear lest party motives shd. be imputed to him. He then censured the Treasury for mentioning this case in their notes, & thus trying to carry success for Mr. Quin by numbers, instead of seeking the truth by impartial investigation.

Wm. Courtenay & Peel are Quin's advisers. They are both greatly affected by this destruction of Mr. Goold's testimony, & they grieve that Quin did not in the House of Commons rise to state that he recollected the *two* visits, as at least the advantage wd. have been gained of not appearing to be forced to the confession by the expected arrival of the servants from Ireland.

I can scarcely attempt to give you any notion of the general nature of the evidence, for even entering upon the subject would lead me to great

lengths. My belief is that Quin was led to offer the £200 a year from compassion ; & that among the many reasons which induced him to refuse granting the annuity *for life*, it might occur to him that the keeping the power in his own hands wd. be a check upon the Grady family.

The adverse party assert that he began by insisting upon the future support of the Gradys, & that he did not offer to release them from a pledge until he began to fear the consequences of parliamentary enquiry.

Had Mr Goold's evidence been unshaken, the general impression wd., I think, have been favourable to Quin ; but now we have to expect that every word advanced by Mr. Carew Smith will be credited. Peter Moore turns out to have been the instigator of the whole, & he is, in old Grady's letters, represented as a busy bustling fellow, always meddling with other persons concerns, & having his nose in everything, from an actress in the Green room to the affairs of the highest department in the State. Peter Moore & old Grady were friends last summer at Boulogne, & Peter had the pleasure of being in the House when he was thus mentioned.

I must now enter upon our general parliamentary situation.

You were aware before you left town that the Windsor Establt. Bill was to be postponed till after yr. return, & that the intention was to ward off if possible all business of consequence during the week.<sup>1</sup>

For the first two days of the week, I mean before the examination began, we were sitting till very late at night with nearly empty benches on our side of the House, & with benches crammed up to the very corners on the Opposition side. We fortunately escaped the disgrace of dividing in a minority ; but we were ridiculed and laughed at by those of the Opposition with whom any of us talked, & we were told that, seeing we could not get attendance, they had signed a paper binding themselves never upon any occasion to quit the House without Tierney's leave. I know this to be a fact. Of Ministers we had only Van & Robinson, the latter being most restless on his seat, & even asking whether he might not go home. Pole went home to his dinner—Bathurst<sup>2</sup> was really ill, & I understand that Canning had a cold. The latter, since the examinations, has been in the House ; & curiosity has kept proper numbers. Of official men we had very few indeed. Those who staid, complained, as I have heard, that I don't keep good Houses—those who went away equally complain that I require attendance needlessly. Worn out with bodily fatigue & vexation I twice during the week wrote at night to Lord Liverpool that our office men wd. not attend, & that the independent members declared to me that they wd. not try to support those in office who wd. not take the trouble of trying to support themselves. After passing a long night of worry & alarm lest we shd. be in a minority, the evil of non-attendance was thought so serious that Long & Huskisson went with me to Fife House, and joined with me in declaring that the Govt. would be broken down in a fortnight's time unless those in office wd., throughout the evening,

<sup>1</sup> Queen Charlotte's death occasioned a reduction in the annual parliamentary grant for the Windsor establishment from £100,000 to £50,000.

<sup>2</sup> Charles Bragge-Bathurst, chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, 1812-23.

*without pairing off*, devote themselves to the House. Lord L. talked a great deal of what was expected from official men in his early years, but he wd. not have been moved to take the proper step if it had not been suggested that you & he together shd. call a meeting. To this he has agreed; & I trust that the language at the meeting to the official men will be so decided & even peremptory as to leave to them no alternative. They must be told that it is expected of them all to be there during the whole course of every evening, & that the coming down merely to get a pair will not do. I am as adverse as any one to measures of harshness; but I do assure you that I shall not be equal to the task imposed upon me unless I am supported, & indeed I must add that the odiousness of my H. of Commons duties is become so hateful to me that were I but tolerably independent in my circumstances I wd. not hold my present office one session longer. I don't think that the sacrifice could be required of me which I wd. not make to serve *you*; but in the easiest times it wd. require the buoyancy of youthful spirits not to be affected by my parliamentary work, and now it has become nearly insupportable. I find from wellwishers & friends of mine that at the clubs the country gentlemen talk loudly of my presuming to ask them to stay when the office men are not there; & here it is to be remembered that with all our sweeping reductions of patronage, I have not the tie I once had upon the independent members.

On the other hand I equally well know that the office men themselves are equally indignant at my attempting to force them down to the House, for, say they, we are called to divisions, & divisions do not take place. I may be fuller of my own grievances than may be right, but it does indeed dwell upon my mind & spirits that on account of my still having a heavy debt I dare not be free agent, & either go out of office altogether, or ask whether, after so many years of hard servitude, I might not look up to some other situation, & be thus liberated from the misery of offending everyone whilst I am slaving to preserve the Govt. from disgrace.

From this more personal subject I will proceed to that which belongs more generally to the Government itself.

In the short space of one week I have seen more symptoms of our unstable state than I had ever done before. Peel is in everybody's mouth—not as a person to be at the head of the Government, but rather as one to replace poor Van, who is abused, ridiculed & deserted by everybody. In the City he has fallen lower than could be imagined. He is there abused for what are called his miserable expedients since the conclusion of peace. He is said to have ruined numbers by his financial plan of last year,<sup>1</sup> connected as it was with a sort of assurance that there wd. be no loan or funding this year. The Bank

<sup>1</sup> In 1818 the national debt was about £50,000,000 less than in November 1815, an illusory reduction, however, since, in order to continue the policy of debt redemption, the unfunded debt had been increased by about £18,000,000. Vansittart then funded £27,000,000 of exchequer bills by converting the existing 3% stock into 3½% stock, the holders paying £11 in cash for every £100 of 3% stock, on account of the higher interest they were to receive.

are most loud against him ; & it is declared of him by all parties & all descriptions of men, that altho' in private life a good man, there is no belief to be attached to a word he says, as he one day declares in the House that no funding will be required, & the next day it is generally known that there must be a great funding.

This is the substance of what I have heard from various quarters. It makes the more impression on me, as I do not merely learn it in the House of Commons, where men's interests may be against him, or where he may have failed of attracting men to him by his want of power as a speaker, but I hear the same from Hill & from Herries, who are both of them his devoted friends & adherents. In the meantime Van is proceeding with all the unwary simplicity of honesty & truth, for I believe that a better person never existed, and should the storm of general dissatisfaction burst upon him, it will find him totally unprepared. He will be partly the victim of the real financial difficulties of the country ; & partly he will have been made responsible for measures not matured & digested exclusively by himself, but by the sort of commission wch. has had to decide upon the duties of his own office. The saving him much longer is, I shd. fear, quite hopeless, & if I have not talked much recently with Ld. L. upon all that is daily said to me, it is because I have not wished to agitate a most nervous mind just in the very midst of our parliamentary difficulties.

Whether Peel is much at work to collect adherents I cannot pretend to say. I shall never suspect him of any dishonest deeds, but it is in human nature to be pleased with the sort of following which he must observe is now attaching to him. He has dinners without end, & this he is enabled to have throughout the week, not only by his own great means, but also by his never being tied to the House when we are obliged to be attending to the debates. Except on the examination of the witnesses, I never see him remain in the House after the general dinner hour. I shd. think he showed better taste if he wd. let it be seen that he was still closely connected with the Government to which he so recently belonged.<sup>1</sup>

That we shall get thro' this session is my firm belief ; but a change, & a very considerable change during the next summer appears to me inevitable. You know full well all that is passing in Canning's mind. We may imagine what is passing in Peel's mind, & it is ever to be recollected that to Peel there are belonging some persons who on their own accounts are boiling over with impatience at his not being already in high office.

It is for your own interests as our leader in the H. of Commons that I think the most. Without appearing to make enquiries, I have been able to convince myself that you stand as well as man can do, that there is the greatest confidence in you, & that when you are present, & are from good health able to make exertions, *all does well*. But there is a growing feeling that in consequence of measures originating among the peers, the H. of Commons part of the Government is often, as it is said, dragged thro' the mire ; & we are

<sup>1</sup> Peel had resigned the Irish secretaryship in the summer of 1818.



accused of that sort of wavering conduct wch. gives to the Opposition the credit of having been able to controul the Government.

I think I have now told you all that I know, & all that I have learnt from others. I do not believe that I have taken a more unfavourable view of our situation than truth wd. justify. I am convinced that the Opposition cannot succeed against us; but I am equally convinced that there is that unsoundness among ourselves wch. prevents our exerting our whole strength, & that looking both to the credit of the Governmt. & to its future stability, there must be an effort next summer to reorganise & to strengthen the whole machine.

Of what has passed in the Bank Committee this last week I have heard very little.<sup>1</sup> Nothing very important has occurred there, & I learn that they are beginning to be tired of taking evidence. I shd. imagine that on your return to the Committee, you will begin to think of the report.

We have been working hard to have a good attendance on Thursday next. Since the Walcheren question I never exerted myself so much, & I begin to flatter myself that by keeping some evil ones away, & by bringing up others from a gt. distance, we shall have a much better division than the Opposition expect.<sup>2</sup> I know that they among themselves are elated with hopes, but my strong belief is that they will be egregiously disappointed. On Tuesday next I will show you what we may expect.

Tomorrow we shall have 2 witnesses on Quin's business; & I shd. imagine that we may afterwards get to the Windsor Bill, which is altered & now perfect, I hope. Huskisson, the Sol Genl., Wm. Harrison, Hill & myself worked at it last Sunday in my home.

We have from day to day expected to have the snuff boxes question, but Hutchinson wd. not go upon it at the very late hour it wd. have been practicable. I learn that he is scouted by the Opposition & by Tierney himself.<sup>3</sup>

#### 14. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Walmer Castle, 29 March 1820. Private.*— . . . I will not now enter upon the question of the Civil List.<sup>4</sup> It will require much management in whatever way it is to be viewed, and I am only anxious that our friends should not

<sup>1</sup> On 3 February 1819 a secret committee of the house of commons was appointed to consider the possibility of the resumption of cash payments by the Bank of England.

<sup>2</sup> Sir M. W. Ridley's motion to reduce the number of junior lords of the Admiralty was rejected on the 18th by 245 to 164. In 1810 the Perceval Ministry had been fiercely attacked for the mismanagement of the Walcheren expedition.

<sup>3</sup> On 19 March Christopher Hely-Hutchinson, M.P. for Cork City, criticised various items of expenditure, including one of £22,510 for snuff-boxes as presents to foreign ministers between July 1816 and January 1819.

<sup>4</sup> George IV expected a much larger civil list than he had enjoyed as prince regent, but his ministers considered that in view of the impoverished state of the 'lower orders', the house of commons would refuse to impose new burdens on the people. The king, said Eldon on 26 April, 'has been pretty well disposed to part with us all, because we would not make additions to his revenue'. On 25 April he gave way, and the civil list, freed from the expenses of George III's establishment, was reduced from its 1816 level of £1,083,000 to £845,000. See *George IV corresp.*, II. 325-6

commit themselves before the matter has been fully & fairly consider'd. This cannot be done till after Castlereagh's return, which may be expected by the 2d or 3d of April. I should hope that we should have the estimates for the Departments before the middle of next week, I could then put the whole question into shape with the assistance of Hill, and I should like to have a *quiet* discussion with Castlereagh before the points are submitted to our *confidential Committee*. The subject however should not be delay'd, the deliberation of the Cabinet need not be of long continuance, but *time* will be requisite to reconcile the King's mind to the arrangement, and we must not put this off, as we were obliged to do in the case of the Princess <sup>1</sup> to the last moment. I should think that the most convenient time for you to leave London would be the middle of next week, & I should certainly be glad that both Huskisson & Long should be in town by the end of the Easter week.<sup>2</sup>

I got the account this morning of the successful result of the Devon contest ; this is a most important triumph.<sup>3</sup> Tierney knows that he lies when he says that the Govt. are unpopular ; they are on the contrary highly popular when compared with the Opposition, but I feel the Radicals have gained ground in many parts of England, & still more in Scotland. They have as yet fortunately little or no existence in the eastern part of this country.

#### 15. Charles Arbuthnot to his wife.

*Saturday* [4 November 1820].—It seemed at one time as if we shd. have concluded the debate <sup>4</sup> tonight ; but it is adjourned till Monday. Lord Liverpool began the debate in continuation of his speech, & a magnificent one it was. I was nervous about him yesterday, for he was hoarse & seemed embarrassed. Today he was admirable, & made her guilt as glaring as we know it is. Castlereagh was close to me, & was as much pleased with it as myself. We had a few words from Ld. Falmouth for the 2nd reading, & against the *divorce* part of the Bill. Lord Harrowby got up to say that in the Committee he also shd. be against the divorce. After this we had Ld. Ellenborough who made a speech as eccentric as he is himself. He was agst. the 2nd reading chiefly because of the cry throughout the country. The Chancellor had said in his speech 'Be just & fear not'. Lord Ellenborough, quoting these words, said, 'Be just & *politic*'. But then he did lay it on the Queen most unmercifully, calling her the worst & most degraded of women, & saying that he was confident there was not a peer who wd. not rather have his wife resemble any other woman than the Queen. He expressed his conviction of her guilt, & he hoped that the Bill wd. not pass, but that there wd. be an address to the Crown of severe censure upon her. We had then

<sup>1</sup> The princess of Wales, then Queen Caroline.

<sup>2</sup> In 1823 Liverpool said that Huskisson 'has been for years one of the little Committee by which all the parliamentary business has been settled' (Add. MS. 38291, fo. 336).

<sup>3</sup> Lord Ebrington, the whig candidate, was defeated at the Devonshire election, the numbers being, Sir Thomas Dyke Acland 2,546, E. P. Bastard 1,959, and Ebrington 1,793.

<sup>4</sup> On the second reading of the Bill of Pains and Penalties.

a long legal twaddle from Ld. Erskine. We had then Ld. de Dunstanville for the Bill. Also Ld. Manners, who spoke well & very strongly indeed against the Queen. He was not loud enough. We had the D. of Newcastle for the Bill—and he was followed by Ld. Lansdowne, who was very severe upon the D. of N. for having said that he shd. vote against the Bill, tho' he had been absent during the defence. Ld. Lansdowne spoke for some time & then the House adjourned upon its being intimated by the Chancellor that several peers had announced to him their intention of speaking. I am told that Lord Grenville will speak. I hope he will, as his speech will carry very gt. authority with it. I am sorry that there seems no daylight as to getting rid of the Bill in the Lords. Castlereagh, I see, wishes it, but they all seem to think it not practicable. Indeed, today he was talking to me of the arrangements we must make when it comes to the Commons. The Duke<sup>1</sup> feels that it wd. be disgraceful to get rid of it by any trick. So it wd., but I wish some honourable mode cd. present itself. . . .

Cast[lereagh] took me to dinner, but he was so late that they were at table; & we came away very early as there was a Cabinet. The Lievens & Decazes were there. . . .

I must conclude, for Bloomfield has desired me to recommence my reports,<sup>2</sup> wch. I had discontinued—a great bore. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Carlton House, Monday evening* [6 November 1820].— . . . We have divided 123 to 95—only 28 majority. But still we are in high spirits; for her guilt has been pronounced most forcibly by many who voted agst. the Bill, & Lord Grenville made a speech for the Bill wch. stamps her guilt beyond redemption. In short, her character is blasted for ever. 123 have pronounced guilt, & even the furious among the Opposition have owned suspicion & gross impropriety of conduct. I have been with Ld. Liverpool & Lord Castlereagh since the division, & their minds are in a most comfortable state, the guilt having been pronounced much more conclusively than we had ever anticipated. I am sure the Governmt. now, as to stability, stands much firmer than I had expected, & whatever may be the fate of the Bill, the King & his Administration have been fully justified for the enquiry into her conduct. She *is blasted*, & that is sufficient. Tomorrow we vote the preamble, & Castlereagh thinks we shall have an increased majority. Between ourselves, I now expect that the Bill will not come to the Commons—of this I shall be able to tell you more tomorrow. The D. of Dorset went away *without* voting. The D. of Richmond voted against the Bill. So did Lord Bath—so did Ld. Egremont—Ld. Hutchinson went away without voting. So did Lord Hampden. In short, the King's friends deserted him. Two Lords of the Bedchamber against the Bill. But what is satisfactory is the proclamation of her guilt from all quarters. . . . We are in good cheer, I assure you.

I think it may be better than a larger majority, for it may *help* us out of the Bill. Lord Warwick was *for* the Bill.

<sup>1</sup> Wellington.

<sup>2</sup> Of the house of commons' debates, for the King's information. These, unfortunately, have not been preserved.

## 16. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Coombe Wood, 13 November 1820.*— . . . I order'd summonses for a Cabinet for tomorrow in consequence of a letter from Keppel Craven on the part of the Queen, claiming palace & establishment &c. I likewise received a letter from the Chancellor giving a most unsatisfactory account of his conversation with the King.<sup>1</sup> In short, we are in a sea of troubles, & God only knows how we are to get out of them. I am sorry Bathurst is gone out of town—he must be brought back again.

I do not like Huskisson's letter. The tone & spirit of it is most uncomfortable. In short I am thoroughly disgusted. I feel I have few, very few, publick friends in the world. I wish only to be thoroughly & honourably released. I will not abandon others, but I am by no means sure that they will not abandon me & leave me to be the *sole* victim of the present clamour.

I trust you will get this in the morning & that you will be able to apprise Castlereagh how important it is he should be in town. I shall be in town before one o'clock.

## 17. The Earl of Liverpool to the Duke of Wellington.

*Walmer Castle, 7 December 1820. Private.*—I am much obliged to you for your letter, and was most sincerely rejoiced to hear of the reception which the inhabitants & citizens of Norwich had given to the Duke of York and to yourself. I trust the temper of the country is improving. Woodehouse's opinions are very satisfactory; he is well disposed towards the Govt., but not one of the country gentlemen on whom I should most rely. I hope his judgement on this occasion will be a sample, therefore, of what we may expect from others.<sup>2</sup> I wish all was right at *headquarters*, but this language is most imprudent, to say the least of it, and such as may lead to very serious consequences. He is doing everything to shake the confidence of the publick in his Govt. at a time when they require all the support he could give them. . . .<sup>3</sup>

## 18. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Fife House, 9 December 1820. Private & confidential.*—I am just returned,<sup>4</sup> and the better certainly for my excursion. The weather has been delightful.

<sup>1</sup> For the king's disposition to change his government see *George IV corresp*, II. 377–93, and Wellington's *Despatches, corresp. and memoranda* [1867], I. 150 (henceforth quoted as *W.N.D.*).

<sup>2</sup> Edmund Woodehouse was M.P. for Norfolk.

<sup>3</sup> The king was angry with his ministers for their refusal to settle the queen's affairs (the questions of a royal residence, the restoration of her name to the liturgy, and an income) before the adjournment of parliament in November.

<sup>4</sup> From Walmer Castle.

Canning & Ch[arles] Ellis as well as Wallace<sup>1</sup> were with me. I am sorry to say that I fear the determination of the first is taken.<sup>2</sup> However do not talk about it till I have seen you. He professes, and I believe sincerely, that it grows out of the *awkwardness* of his own situation, personally, and does not arise from any difference of opinion, and that it is his intention to go to Paris and remain there till after Easter. When he stated his difficulties to the King, the King did not express the least anxiety to keep him. . . .

*Ibid.*, Coombe Wood, 22 December 1820. *Private & confidential*.—You will be glad to hear that I have had a very satisfactory letter from Wortley.

1, *Quite right* upon the Liturgy, even to our going out if we are *beat* upon it.

2, has some doubts about the palace but none which may not be got over by explanation.

3, thinks £50,000 a year too much, & if it is granted should be granted annually in order to hold some check & controul over her. This is the sum of his opinions, and I have little doubt therefore we shall have his support, and in the most useful manner.<sup>3</sup>

Castlereagh's letter to Canning has done much good.<sup>4</sup> . . .

*Ibid.*, Fife House, 4 January 1821.\* *Private & confidential*.— . . . I have heard nothing very new, except that Littleton is likely to be right on the question of the Liturgy<sup>5</sup>; and Lord Calthorpe, whom I have seen twice in the course of the last week, and to whom Wilberforce had communicated my letter (tho' I could not extract from him either Wilberforce's opinion or his own) seemed clearly, however, to think that the impression amongst well-disposed persons would be to resist any motion on this subject.<sup>6</sup> I do not think therefore we shall have as much difficulty on this question, as at one time we expected; but until Parliament meets, it is very difficult to ascertain what are the points on which we may be most pressed.

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Wallace, one of Canning's contemporaries at Eton and Christ Church, was at this time vice-president of the board of trade.

<sup>2</sup> Disapproving of the Government's treatment of Queen Caroline after the abandonment of the Bill of Pains and Penalties on 10 November, Canning resigned his office of president of the board of control on 13 December. On the 4th he had gone to Walmer with his closest friend, Charles Ellis, who was Liverpool's nephew, to discuss his situation. He communicated to his colleagues his letter to the king before it was sent.

<sup>3</sup> On 5 December Castlereagh wrote a private and confidential circular letter to the government's parliamentary supporters, informing them of the line which Ministers intended to pursue with regard to the queen on the re-assembly of parliament, and inviting them to communicate their own and their friends' views. Liverpool too wrote to a number of the independent members of the house of commons, and Stuart-Wortley's reply, dated the 18th, is in Yonge's *Liverpool*, iii. 114.

<sup>4</sup> Printed in Stapleton's *Canning and his times*, p. 319 (19 December). Castlereagh, his old rival, expressed his regret at his resignation.

<sup>5</sup> Goulburn, the under-secretary of state for war and the colonies, had written to Littleton on the subject of the queen's affairs, on 19 December 1820, inquiring what were his views and those of other country gentlemen whom he knew. Littleton, who had been a member of Canning's 'connexion', represented Staffordshire.

<sup>6</sup> Liverpool's letter to Wilberforce (29 November 1820), which was similar to the one he wrote to Stuart-Wortley, is in Yonge's *Liverpool*, iii. 111. His reply was limited to an acknowledgement of the receipt of the letter.

## 19. Charles Arbuthnot to Robert Willimott.

*Downing Street, 17 June 1821. Secret & confidential. Draft.*—Not being willing to run the chance of worrying Lord Liverpool, I abstain from even acknowledging the receipt of his secret & confidential letters.<sup>1</sup> As, however, you know the contents of those letters, I can have no scruple in writing a few lines to you upon the subject of them, as perhaps at a convenient moment you may be able to let him know what steps I took after I had read them. I first showed those letters to Lord Londonderry.<sup>2</sup> He & I agreed that it would be adviseable to have a meeting at his house of the members of the Cabinet who, by Lord Liverpool's desire, were to see the correspondence which had recently passed between him & the King. The Duke of Wellington, Lord Bathurst, Lord Sidmouth & Lord Melville came yesterday to Lord Londonderry's, where I also was present. It was unanimously agreed that nothing ought to be done or even attempted with the King until Lord Liverpool shd. be capable of sufficient exertion to communicate with his Majesty.<sup>3</sup> No evil, it was felt, could be so great as that which would necessarily arise from carrying on the discussions at Carlton House while Lord Liverpool could not be a party to them; & it therefore was at once determined that the whole should be suspended for the present. The Duke of Wellington, if he should see the King, will state the necessity of this suspense; but at the same time he will not fail to give his decided opinion that H.M. should re-admit Mr. Canning into the Cabinet, or adopt any other measure to strengthen his Govt. which Lord L[iverpool] should recommend.<sup>4</sup>

There was but one point about which there was in our discussion some doubt. It was feared that the King's repugnance to Mr. Canning might become public. It was deliberated therefore whether Mr. Canning ought to be informed of it; but without here entering into the reasons for being silent, it was upon the whole thought best that in the present state of things no communication should be made to him, unless he should seek it.

I must now say one word in respect to an apparent difference of opinion between Lord Liverpool & his colleagues. They all go along with him in thinking it very desirable that Mr. Canning should again be in office with them. But they doubted whether they could be justified in determining to force him upon the King at this precise moment, an assurance being given by his Majesty that it was not proscription, & that he only begged for time,

<sup>1</sup> That of the 15th is in Yonge's *Liverpool*, III. 146.

<sup>2</sup> Castlereagh had succeeded his father as second marquess of Londonderry in April

<sup>3</sup> The death of his wife (12 June), to whom he had been much attached, had affected his health and spirits

<sup>4</sup> Liverpool was anxious to strengthen his government by securing the services of Canning, Peel and Charles Wynn, as the representative of the Grenville connexion in the house of commons. But on 4 June Peel declined the office of president of the board of control, which Bragge-Bathurst had held *ad interim* since Canning's resignation, and a few days later the King rejected Liverpool's advice to appoint Canning first lord of the admiralty. George IV had not forgiven Canning for siding with the queen, and believed, erroneously, that Canning's friends in the house of lords had voted against the Bill of Pains and Penalties on his advice

& it not being disowned by Mr. Canning himself that some cause of dissatisfaction had, however unintentionally, been given. This is the only shade of difference between Lord Liverpool & his colleagues. With him they are most anxious to act upon this point, as upon all others, in perfect union ; & they feel confident that when Ld. Liverpool recovers sufficient strength to discuss the whole with them, all apparent difference or misconception will be removed. If the King should refuse to his Cabinet the means of acquiring strength, such a determination on his part wd. naturally inspire distrust ; but it was felt by those of Lord Liverpool's colleagues who met yesterday at Lord Londonderry's, that the touchstone of the King's sincerity will be his refusal or his consent to make a proposal to the Grenvilles. If this should be refused, it might then be inferred that the King had determined to keep his present Government in that state of comparative weakness which would enable him to destroy it when he pleased.<sup>1</sup> If, on the contrary, the King should readily consent to a junction with the Grenvilles, it would be equally obvious that he could have no such project ; for the union with this powerful family would not only add strength & respectability to ourselves, but it must necessarily deprive his Majesty of one of the chief elements to which he would look when he undertook the formation of a new Government.

I am merely touching these subjects in very general terms. When Lord Liverpool shall feel himself equal to a discussion with Ld. Londonderry & his other colleagues, every point will be gone through in detail ; but I have thought it right to give you the opportunity of letting Lord Liverpool know that nothing will be done, or, indeed, can be done, during his absence, & I have also been desirous of just adverting to the test of the King's sincerity which has presented itself to our minds.<sup>2</sup>

## 20. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Downing Street, Wednesday, 4 July 1821.*— . . . There never was so stormy a session, or so laborious a one. The agricultural distress is very

<sup>1</sup> The king was deeply offended with Liverpool for opposing Mr. Sumner's appointment to a canonry of Windsor, and for seeking to force Canning on him.

<sup>2</sup> Wellington's views were recorded by Arbuthnot in a memorandum :

'We should support Lord Liverpool *à toute ouïance* ; we should do our utmost to persuade the King to admit Canning, but I cannot be a party to breaking up the Government for the sake of Canning. My conviction is that the country will be ruined, & all the foreign interests of the country destroyed if the Whigs come into power, therefore my first & main object is to keep the Whigs *out*. Acting upon this principle, altho' it will be my great effort to keep the Government together, I cannot say, if the King, upon the dissolution of our present union shd. endeavour to form another Administration in opposition to the Whigs, that I will refuse office. When I came into office I declared that I would not bind myself to be a party to anything which was to take place after our Government was dissolved, & I say the same now. I wish to see things remain as they are. I will do all that depends on me to keep them as they are ; but if I fail in this, I am not, with the view which I take of the subject, to run the chance of running the country merely because I cannot persuade the King to take Mr. Canning.' See, too, his letter to Bathurst, 24 June, in *W.N.D.*, i. 176.

great, & this has pressed so severely upon our country gentlemen that they have been out of humour, & have supported us very ill. Lord Castlereagh (now Ld. Londonderry) has done wonders; & his reputation stands very high indeed. We must make great reductions, civil & military, but don't talk of this. . . .

## 21. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Fife House, 22 July 1821. Most private & confidential.*—I am much obliged to you for your letter, with the account of the conversation between the Duke of Wellington, Sir B. Bloomfield and yourself. Lord Harrowby and Lord Sidmouth happened to be here at the time I received it. I read it to them, & we all agree in doing full justice to the Duke of Wellington for the proper and manly way in which he express'd sentiments common to us all.

Since I saw you I have the best reason for believing that the respectable part of our friends *expect* that we shall resist the appointment of Lord Conyngham to be Lord Chamberlain,<sup>1</sup> & think we ought to resist it. As strong objections exist to his being Master of the Horse. It is not, indeed, an office of equal rank & patronage as that of the Lord Chamberlain, but the circumstance of his having the royal carriages & livery's make it still more *voyant* & offensive in the eyes of the publick. The office of Groom of the Stole stands upon different grounds, and the objections applicable to the two others do not seem to apply to this. It is right you should know my feelings and the result of my reflections on these matters before they are brought to a point. . . .

## 22. The Marquess of Londonderry to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Royal George, Holyhead, 11 August [1821], 12 o'clock. Private.*—I arrived here late on Wednesday night and found the King on board the yacht [*sic*] in the Roads.<sup>2</sup> I waited on him in the morning, having decided to proceed on the steam boat, but was order'd to remain with his Majesty. Perhaps I may have been of some use at such a moment in keeping up the correspondence with Lord Liverpool in London and Lord Sidmouth in Dublin.

When I came on board, I brought intelligence that left little doubt of the fatal issue of the Queen's illness, and when I carried to the King the news of her Majesty's actual death,<sup>3</sup> H.M. received the intimation as we could have wished; and has since not been unreasonable as to any of the observances recommended for his sanction.

<sup>1</sup> Lady Conyngham had superseded Lady Hertford as George IV's mistress, and on the 18th, the eve of the coronation, Lord Hertford had resigned the office of lord chamberlain. Because of Lady Conyngham's intrigues against the Government and her interference with ecclesiastical patronage, the ministers were determined not to acquiesce in the appointment of her husband to one of the highest household situations.

<sup>2</sup> The king was on his way to Ireland, travelling by sea from Portsmouth.

<sup>3</sup> On the 7th.



The weather has been as bad as possible—the wind blowing hard from the westward. We hope it is improving, and that we shall get over tomorrow. The delay is the less material, with so much of the time passing very quietly here, which must otherwise have been consumed in privacy at the park.

We made a rapid journey, and found the same change of publick sentiment as at the Coronation in all the large towns, the same demonstrations as on that day. It began at Coventry, then Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Stafford, and Shrewsbury—what surprized me most was the favor I found in the eyes of Peter Moore's and Bernal's constituents.<sup>1</sup> . . .

### 23. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Coombe Wood, 28 August 1821. Confidential.*—I think it right you should know what passed with the Chancellor after you were gone. I told him *generally* without reference to anything immediate, that I understood we were very much abused, and that I could not avoid thinking that *he*<sup>2</sup> would sooner or later try to get rid [of] us. The Chancellor say'd that this concur'd with his information, & he added that he had had a letter from Lord Sidmouth in which, after saying that all publick matters in Ireland had gone off well, he adds, 'But there are evident symptoms of a great storm hanging over us.'

*Ibid., Walmer Castle, 5 September 1821. Most private.*—I wrote to Bathurst and to the Duke of Wellington last night to say I concur'd in the dismissal of Sir Robt. Wilson, without any call upon him for explanation, provided the depositions against him were upon oath, and were such as could leave no doubt that the facts stated in them are substantially true.<sup>3</sup> In order to save a letter to Bathurst, will you tell him that the inclination of my mind is that the Duke of York, in announcing to Sir Robt. his dismissal, should not state any reasons. These will be our justification afterwards, but there is no doubt the King can dismiss an officer in virtue of his prerogative, & it is very important that we should not put Sir Robt. in possession of our case and of our evidence so long before the only discussion which can take place upon such a question in Parliament, can be brought forward.

Notwithstanding Bathurst's confidence, I still doubt the Hanover journey.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Peter Moore and Ralph Bernal then represented Coventry and Rochester respectively, and were opposition members. Bernal sat for Lincoln in the previous parliament.

<sup>2</sup> The king Sidmouth reported to Liverpool on the 29th from Phoenix Park. 'The King is in a very uncomfortable state of mind. The circumstances attending the Queen's funeral he is perpetually recurring to in a manner which shows a degree of chagrin and irritation beyond what I have ever observed in him. These feelings have not affected his general behaviour and deportment so as to attract the observation, except of a very few, but the actual expression of them has not been so confined and limited as could be wished.' The government had disregarded the king's orders to remove the queen's body privately by water from Brandenburg House, Hammersmith, to the warship which was to convey it to Germany; and the conveyance of her remains to Harwich by land resulted in a serious riot in London on the 14th.

<sup>3</sup> General Sir Robert Wilson was dismissed from the army on the 15th for interfering with the military during the riot which attended the queen's funeral procession through London on 14 August. His object was to avert bloodshed.

<sup>4</sup> George IV visited Hanover in October.

I may be wrong, but I am sure we ought to be prepared for its being given up, and for the consequences. Huskisson, in his note to you, says the Duke of York *positively* says the journey to Hanover is given up. Attend then to Goulburn's report of his conversation with Sir Wm. Knighton, & consider who Sir Wm. K. is. Add to this, what I told you before I left London, which is confirmed as far as it was likely to be confirmed by the letters of Sidmouth, Londonderry & Pole. Gordon's<sup>1</sup> report to his brother of the King's notification of his visit to Vienna will, in my judgement, form an additional motive for suspending the whole journey. The King *cannot* go to Vienna so late in the year. He will be told so, and this will afford him a pretence for putting off his journey to the Continent till the early part of next summer. . . .

*Ibid.*, Walmer Castle, 7 September 1821. *Private*.— . . . I have determined to set out tomorrow after the post & to sleep tomorrow night in town. I do not like travelling on Sunday without necessity, & I think putting off my return to Monday would be exposing it to risks which I would rather avoid. I have no doubt I shall be in full time tomorrow.

You may rely upon it the journey to Hanover depends *entirely* upon the lady.<sup>2</sup> If she is against it either on publick or private grounds, it will be given up. A short time will solve this & various other difficulties.

*Ibid.*, Walmer Castle, 27 September 1821. *Private & confidential*.—The reception of the King at Ramsgate was very satisfactory, and his passage to Calais quite prosperous with the exception of a good knocking which he got on going ashore at Calais in consequence of the boat striking the ground. His manner to me was not OVER cordial, but not sufficiently otherwise to attract observation, and upon the whole I have no right to complain. I did all in my power to make his visit within the Cinque Ports popular, & gratifying to him. I am sure he saw that such was my intention. Sir Wm. Knighton was with him; he appear'd to be the man of business. To my surprise the Marqs. of Conyngham was with him likewise, and has accompanied him to Hanover. This looks like preparing him for a Household situation. If the King is *determined* to break with us it will not be upon this, I think it will be upon Canning.

I have had a long letter from O'Bryen. It is not worth troubling you with the contents of it now. I have written a short answer and I am only anxious that he should receive what we allow him, if possible, before the 11th of Octr. You can, I suppose, easily arrange this. . . .

The crops here are all secured & I have nothing to say on that subject. I think it quite clear now the ports will not open in Novr.<sup>3</sup> If prices could be kept between 60 & 70 [shillings] the farmers would be well satisfied. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Robert Gordon, Lord Aberdeen's brother, was secretary of embassy at Vienna, 1815-26, and at this time minister plenipotentiary *ad interim*.

<sup>2</sup> Lady Conyngham. She saw that she would be unable to accompany the king, and she was reluctant to allow him to go.

<sup>3</sup> That is, that the home price of corn would not rise to 80 shillings per quarter, the price at which corn could be imported under the provisions of the 1815 Act. At the end of September the price was just over 70 shillings—the highest for the year.

## 24. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Woodford, 2 October 1821.*— . . . I believe I told you in my<sup>1</sup> last that we were not on the best of terms with the King. I fear that there is not now much more cordiality, for the *Lady*<sup>1</sup> does not like us; but still I feel very confident that the Government will not be changed. You will have seen in the papers that the King's reception in Ireland was most highly gratifying. He is now, you will have learnt by the papers, gone to Hanover, & I am availing myself of the quiet during his absence to enjoy the country. . . .

## 25. The Marquess of Londonderry to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Hanover, 27 October [1821].*— . . . We leave Hanover the day after to-morrow. I like the people better than my friend Clanwilliam<sup>2</sup> does, who rather scouts them in point of manners and ton. There are some good looking ladies, but there being a flight of Princes here, not even Madme. Munster has fallen, to my shame. I have however consoled myself with Madme. de Decken, who flourish'd during the Seven Years' War, and is now turn'd of 82, but has still more to say for herself than the youngest of them.<sup>3</sup>

The King has been going to the Play and doing all sorts of right things, so his visit will end well in spite of the gout. I shall precede the King by two or three days, and expect to reach Calais the 5th. . . .

## 26. The Marquess of Londonderry to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Cray Farm, Thursday [13 December 1821]. Private.*— . . . I have heard nothing further of the Grenvilles. I presume Wynne is inditing his explanation to Lord Liverpool.<sup>4</sup>

I left the King on Tuesday in the most perfect good humour with his Government. His health and spirits appear to have gain'd, as matters have subsided into a more tranquil state. I had a further opportunity at Brighton of discussing with Lord Wellesley his course in Ireland, as also with Goulburne, and when I say that *we three were* d'accord, I think you will give us credit for being near the truth, and that the Duke would now find his brother's mind in a more digested state. . . .<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lady Conyngham.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Clanwilliam, British minister at Berlin, 1823-8, was at this time acting under-secretary of state for foreign affairs.

<sup>3</sup> Count Münster was the Hanoverian minister in London, and Baron Decken was one of the ministers of the electorate.

<sup>4</sup> The Grenville connexion now joined the government. Wynn's letter of the 11th stated that he must reserve the right to originate, either in parliament or in the cabinet, any proposition relating to the Catholic question (Buckingham, *Memoirs of court of George IV*, 1. 249).

<sup>5</sup> Wellesley now succeeded Lord Talbot as lord-lieutenant, and Goulburn, an anti-Catholic, replaced Charles Grant as Irish secretary.

*Ibid.*, *Foreign Office*, 5 January 1822. *Private*.—I am sure it will be a great relief to you, as it certainly is to me, to learn that our difficulties about Plunkett are at an end. Lord Wellesley's despatches are not yet arrived, but I have seen a private letter from Goulburne to Lord Sidmouth stating that Saurin from personal reasons declines the Chief Justiceship, which removes all difficulty in the arrangements. It is a further gratification to me to find that Saurin is not likely to go out in ill humour or to separate from the Govt. in his general habits of intercourse.<sup>1</sup>

*Ibid.*, *Foreign Office*, Tuesday [8 January 1822]. *Private*.—I have seen this morning Lord Wellesley's letters to Lords L[iverpool] & S[idmouth]. I think they shew that he is disposed to pursue the middle path, and the best proof is that he speaks in the highest terms of Goulburne.

The arrangement for Plunkett's immediate nomination is made. Saurin declines the King's Bench, and the peerage, but, as Lord Manners regards him *without grievance*, and as having no person (were he so disposed) to blame but himself, I trust no publick evil can result from his decision.

Bushe goes to the King's Bench—Lord Wellesley expresses himself in the warmest terms of applause of Burke's generous and liberal conduct, disclaiming any disposition to embarrass, and declaring his readiness, if necessary, to act as Solicitor General under Plunkett. Lord W[ellesley] proposes to give the Irish peerage to Downes. The Solicitor is not yet named. He considers it material that it should be some person who will draw well with Plunkett.

I have had a full conversation this morning with Lord L[iverpool] relative to Huskisson. He will write to him today, sooner he could not, as the Grenville arrangements never could be regarded as conclusive whilst the Irish arrangement was open.<sup>2</sup>

I shall write to Goulburne to press an attendance from Ireland. It is obvious that they will try our strength as early as possible upon some question which will give them the chance of shaking our landed support. The repeal of the malt tax is the obvious point for early contests, and we must rally everything to be most relied on.

*Ibid.*, *Pavilion*, Sunday, 6 p.m. [Before 11 March 1822]. *Private*.—We have had a most satisfactory audience. The Duke's report of the King's language to him last night was discouraging, but with his *usual gallantry* he accompanied us into the presence. After disposing of the *smaller points* first, such as *taxes and offices*, I came to Civil List and stated the effect of the deduction of 10 per cent already order'd from the official income of persons paid out of the Civil List. I then submitted the risks we ran of some adverse proceeding, if H.M. made no voluntary surrender out of the Privy Purse

<sup>1</sup> The 'Catholic' William Plunkett succeeded the 'Protestant' William Saurin as Irish attorney-general. William Downes, lord chief justice of Ireland since 1803, was succeeded by Charles Kendal Bushe, who had been Irish solicitor-general.

<sup>2</sup> Liverpool's success in gaining the support of the Grenville party almost lost him the services of Huskisson, who, having held the minor office of the woods and forests since 1814, thought himself due for promotion. Instead he was passed over, and Charles Wynn was appointed to the office of president of the board of control to which Huskisson had aspired.

and the Household Departments, and then suggested whether about 10 per cent] on those classes, amounting to about £800,000, might not be an ample sacrifice for H.M. to make, and for the same period as *his servants*, viz., for 5 years. The King immediately said he thought the proposal a very reasonable one, and that as a *gentleman* he could not do less himself than he had imposed upon his servants. In short, nothing could be more satisfactory than the whole of our interview. . . .<sup>1</sup>

### 27. The Earl of Liverpool\* to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Fife House, 20 May 1822. Private.*—Though I had laid it down as a rule to myself to make no application to Lord Wellesley for Church preferment on personal grounds, except under the most special circumstances, I will certainly mention the case of your brother<sup>2</sup> to him. You have, however, been misinformed as to the preferment likely now to be vacant being definitively settled here. It is perfectly true that as to the *higher* situations in the Church, the opinion of the Government in England is & must always be taken; but upon this occasion Lord Wellesley has recommended his own first Chaplain, Archdeacon Bisset,<sup>3</sup> for the first Irish Bishoprick, & two other clergymen, I believe the most eminent men in Ireland, for succession to the Bench in the event of the general arrangements leading to another vacancy—and his recommendation will of course be taken in these respects, as they would be in all similar cases unless anything was known here to the prejudice of the parties, or the recommendation appeared to have been made under any misapprehension or mistake.

*Ibid., Fife House, 27 August 1822. Most private & confidential* — . . . The King try'd to sound Peel about Canning but Peel behaved most honourably, and the King could get nothing from him. He says nothing which can enable me to guess even at the state of his feelings, but he tells me himself *he is not well*, and Melville writes word that his eyes are much inflamed.<sup>4</sup>

I have written to Peel to press him to come up if possible before the King. He answers that he cannot leave the King before his embarkation, but that he will then come with as little delay as possible. I postpone all discussion as to what may be best to be done, but I cannot wholly put out of my [head]

<sup>1</sup> The agricultural depression which had set in in 1820 reached its lowest point in 1822. The country gentlemen compelled the government drastically to reduce expenditure; taxes amounting to £3,500,000 were remitted, and official salaries were cut down. They were restored to their old amount in 1824. (See *Parl. Deb.*, vi. N.S., 1024.)

<sup>2</sup> Alexander Arbuthnot (1768–1828), dean of Cloynce, 1816; bishop of Killaloe, 1823. See *George IV corresp.*, II. 553.

<sup>3</sup> William Bisset (1758–1834), chancellor of Armagh, 1817; bishop of Raphoe, 1822.

<sup>4</sup> The king was in Scotland when Castlereagh committed suicide on 12 August, and Peel was in attendance on him. George IV was anxious that Canning's appointment as governor-general of Bengal should not be interfered with, and that Wellington should go to the foreign office. Liverpool, however, was determined to have Canning back in the cabinet, and Peel had no desire to stand in his way.

now my own *age* and *personal situation*. If an efficient Govt. can be formed I will not desert my post, but *this* is a *crisis*, & I must see my way before I take a new lease. . . .

## 28. Charles Arbuthnot to his wife.

*Monday, 3 o'clock [2 September 1822].*—I am just come from Ld. Liverpool. He has had a long conversation with Peel. Peel recommends strongly that the King shd. be urged to offer the Foreign Office & the Lead to Canning. It is clear, however, to Ld. Liverpool that if the King shd. not consent to Canning, he, Peel, is ready to undertake the Lead. After seeing Peel, with whom he staid 2 hours, Lord Liverpool went to Carlton House, but he did not see the King, who was engaged with the D. of Cambridge. On coming to Fife House Ld. Liverpool found a note from the Chancellor to tell him that he had seen the King last night, having been sent for by his Majesty. The Chancellor told him no more; but it is obvious that the King had seen him in order to enlist him against Canning.

Whilst I was with Ld. Liverpool a message came from the King to desire him to go up to H.My. I intreated Lord Liverpool to be calm, & not to be drawn by the King into anything like an ultimatum on this day, but on the contrary to desire permission to have tomorrow a full & calm discussion with his My. This he has promised, tho' he talked at first of talking to the King of taking 24 hours to consider, which wd. have been neither more nor less than a menace. The Duke & I agree that Ld. Liverpool must not break up the Government for Canning, tho' it will be wise to try to have him.

You now know everything up to this moment, except that Peel believes that Ld. Melville would prefer letting Canning go to India. . . .<sup>1</sup>

I wish you to keep yrself at single anchor, for shd the Govt. be broken up, you must hurry to me.

*Ibid*, *Monday*— $\frac{1}{2}$  p. 4. [2 September 1822].—I have, my dearest, seen Ld. L[iverpool] since he has been with the King.

Not a word passed between them on business, but it was agreed that Ld. Liverpool is to be with him at 12 tomorrow.

Lord F. Conyngham had told Ld. Clanwilliam that the King will not finally object to Canning's having the Lead provided the Duke will consent to take the F[oreign] Office.

The Duke (as Ld. Bathurst tells me) means to say to the King that he is ever ready to undertake any office that may be pressed upon him, but that being convinced it is not for his own interest or for his Majesty's that he should place himself in a political situation, he must beg to decline the offer. He will, I understand, press upon the King to let Canning have the F. Office.

My tomorrow's letter <sup>a</sup> will be an important one.

<sup>1</sup> Melville hoped that the duke would be asked to take the foreign office, but said he would not oppose Canning's appointment 'if others deemed it on the whole most desirable' (Yonge's *Liverpool*, iii. 198).

<sup>a</sup> Missing.

## 29. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Coombe Wood, 7 September 1822. Private.*—I must wait with philosophical patience for the King's letter,<sup>1</sup> and I only hope that it will not be such as to commit him more deeply on the subject of Canning, or to put the question upon any ground on which it will not be possible to support him.

We feel the greatest anxiety respecting the Duke; the opinions of the medical men are not comfortable, & there may be mischief going on of which they can have no precise knowledge. We shall wish much to hear in the morning, and I will thank you therefore if you will send a messenger as soon as you can obtain a medical report. . . .

Let someone of discretion if possible see the King's letter before it is sent.

*Ibid., Coombe Wood, 15 September 1822. Private.*—I have just received your letter. I confess I was alarmed at the idea of the Duke *setting out* tomorrow,<sup>2</sup> but at the same time I am glad he is so much better as to think of undertaking it. I will certainly call upon him on my way into town tomorrow, at eleven, or very soon after.

I am glad that he means to have some serious conversation with Canning on the point to which you refer. Canning assured me he had no object but Huskisson & Backhouse.<sup>3</sup> It is not, however, the less material that he should be warned against the danger of any attempts such as those meditated on former occasions.

I had heard nothing about Sir W. Knighton being Privy Purse, and I do not know now how the matter has been managed as to Bloomfield.<sup>4</sup>

*Ibid., Fife House, 17 September 1822.*—My audience with the King was very satisfactory, and he has fixed Monday at 3 o'clock for the Council to deliver the seals to Canning. . . .<sup>5</sup>

## 30. Earl Bathurst to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Cirencester, 28 September 1822.*—Many thanks to you for your very satisfactory letter. The Duke's account of himself is as good as we could expect, & I trust that we may consider him as safe. His interview with Lady London-

<sup>1</sup> On the 8th he wrote to Liverpool consenting to Canning's readmission to the cabinet (Yonge's *Liverpool*, iii. 199). The duke was ill in bed.

<sup>2</sup> For Vienna, to attend the Congress which was to discuss the affairs of Greece, Italy and Spain. It transferred itself to Verona.

<sup>3</sup> Before the 8th the King, said Arbuthnot, 'most positively declared that should a proposal be made to him to introduce into the Cabinet any other person, he would not even consent to have an offer made to Canning'. John Backhouse was at this time a clerk, of ten years' standing, in the office of the board of control, and he was to have accompanied Canning to India. Later he was put in charge of the consular department of the F.O.; in April 1827 Canning appointed him permanent under-secretary for foreign Affairs.

<sup>4</sup> Knighton was now appointed keeper of the king's privy purse, and Bloomfield became minister to Sweden.

<sup>5</sup> 'Canning has taken two days to settle what might have been settled in 5 minutes. The duke says, "*Comme les gens d'esprit sont bêtes*".' [Arbuthnot's endorsement.]

derry was much better than I expected. We must allow her to have her feelings, and be prepared for some sparring between the intemperate friends of the two rivals.<sup>1</sup> Lord George Bentinck, who was to have gone to India with Canning,<sup>2</sup> abused Lord Londonderry at Longleat ten days ago, until Lady Grenville gave him a complete set down. I have desired Apsley to write to Lord Ancram an account of what passed at a public meeting at Bristol, gratifying to Lord Londonderry's memory.

As I had ten minutes to spare, waiting for Lady B[athurst] at my office last Tuesday after I saw you, I wrote to Peel, thinking it probable that you would not persuade Lord Liverpool to do so. I gave him a short account of what had passed on the acceptance, & told him how much Lord Liverpool was pressing the King in favour of Lord Hertford,<sup>3</sup> as I know Peel feels a great interest about him.

I know Bankhead to be a most indiscrete gossip, but I believe he has only exaggerated the stories which our poor friend<sup>4</sup> told of himself, just as Lord Clanwilliam is persuaded that he was in the way of receiving a great number of threatening letters. I suspect, however, that Bankhead is induced to repeat them to the[ir] particular friends, partly in his own vindication, & more possibly to make himself of importance with them. If the latter be the motive it is most reprehensible. . . .

### 31. The Duke of Wellington to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Vienna, 2 October 1822.*—I have had two or three long conversations with Lord Londonderry respecting his situation, and at last I believe that I comprehend as much of it as it is possible to comprehend. As soon as he heard of Mr. Canning's appointment he resigned his situation in a letter to the King written in rather a querulous tone; and he wrote at the same time a long letter to Lord Liverpool to inform him that he had so resigned, and complaining of his silence and that of his colleagues, and that they had not asked him to continue in his office. This at least is what I understand of this letter, which, as well as that to the King, contains a good deal of *verbiage* about his own services, merits and demerits. On the following day he wrote a letter to Canning acknowledging the receipt of his, announcing his appointment to be Secty. of State, and he tells Canning that he had resigned his appointment into the King's hands on the preceding day.

I reminded him that I had written to him myself on his brother's death; and had afterwards seen Hardinge,<sup>5</sup> had a long conversation with him, and had desired Harding[e] to request him to take no step till I should have seen

<sup>1</sup> The whole family was incensed at Canning's appointment, and Castlereagh's half-brother, now marquess of Londonderry, at once resigned the Vienna embassy.

<sup>2</sup> As his military secretary.

<sup>3</sup> He was now created K.G. (*Bathurst papers*, p. 534).

<sup>4</sup> Castlereagh. For these stories, see C. K. Webster's *Foreign policy of Castlereagh, 1815-1822*, p. 486, n. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Sir Henry Hardinge, Lord Londonderry's brother-in-law, was at this time tory M.P. for Durham, and in 1823 was appointed clerk of the ordnance.



him. But he did take this step ; and sent his letters home by his son. He certainly looks to the formation of a Stewart party of which he is to be at the head. He was much pleased at Lord Hertford's getting the Garter, of which I informed him ; and I think he looks to the same honor for himself. He is excessively incensed against Canning ; but it is strange that the particular cause should be that Canning did not take an opportunity of praising his brother at the Liverpool meeting !!

His object now is a publick monument for Lord Londonderry. I wanted him to write to Lord Liverpool himself upon the subject, but I could not prevail upon him to do so, and at last I told him I would write ; and I recommend that Lord Liverpool should send the answer to himself. I told him that I was convinced the Govt. would be happy to have any opportunity of paying honour to the memory of Lord Londonderry, but that these matters were decided first by precedent, and that I doubted there being a precedent of a publick monument for any Minister who had not had a publick funeral ; and next by prudential considerations. In this last view it must be observed that it would not honour the memory of his brother to have the vote for a monument carried by a small majority. In answer he said that he could scarcely expect any other than a close majority, Mr. Canning being the Leader, and having omitted to praise his brother at Liverpool !!

He expects that Clancarty will resign<sup>1</sup> ; and I think he intends to endeavour to prevail upon him to do so. He was most surprized when I told him that Robinson<sup>2</sup> had been desirous that Mr. Canning should be appointed to the Foreign Dept. Upon the whole he is as absurd as anybody could believe him to be, and very much out of temper.

I think I am in an awkward position here, the Sovereigns and their Ministers having departed for Verona on the day after my arrival. I should have avoided it if Lord Stewart had sent me a despatch by the Paris road to acquaint me of their determination ; or even if I had remained at Paris another day ; in which case I should have seen the dispatch sent to the French Govt. I hope to be relieved from it in a day or two by orders from home.

If they should not relieve me, I will relieve myself by returning either to Paris or to London if I should be able, in the interval of time between the assembly of the Congress at Verona, and that at Vienna.

3 October.—Since writing the above I have received the discretionary power to go to Verona, & I shall go there in a few days.

*Ibid.*, Vienna, 4 October 1822.—Since writing to you the day before yesterday and yesterday, I have had another conversation with Lord Londonderry, and I think I now understand what he complains of. He thinks himself a great card in the County, and that he ought to have been written to as well from kindness as from attention to his position in the County, and he is very angry with Lord Liverpool, Lord Bathurst and Mr Canning ; and I think he would have remained in office if required to do so. I don't think he will under existing circumstances, as he has dismantled his house &c. He goes to Verona

<sup>1</sup> Clancarty was ambassador to the Netherlands. He was recalled in December 1823.

<sup>2</sup> Who had been one of Castlereagh's personal friends.

with the intention there to present his letter of recall either during or after the conferences on Italian affairs.

He is very anxious respecting the situations which his brother held in Ireland which he certainly ought to have; these were Governor and Custos Rotulorum of the County of Down, and Colonel of the Militia of the County of Derry. Pray take care of them for him, because although I don't think you will keep him right by giving them to him, I wish you so to manage him as to give him no cause for complaint.<sup>1</sup> He is certainly looking to the establishment of himself as the head of a party.

### 32. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Walmer Castle, 21 October 1822. Private.*—I return the Duke of Wellington's letter. I have written a long one to Lord Stewart, which I hope will have the effect of soothing him. I should deeply regret his separating himself from us, as a *matter of feeling*, but he is very much mistaken if he supposes that he can ever make himself a man of much consequence in this country. He is not sufficiently an Englishman *even for the Continent* and still less so for the franchise of Great Britain & Ireland.

I grieve at what you tell me of the Duke of W. How extraordinary that Hume should not have written to any of us. . . . The Duke must be made to recollect that he is passed fifty, and cannot play the same tricks with himself as he could formerly. . . .

*Ibid., Walmer Castle, 1 November 1822. Most Private.*—I have had a letter from our friend in Craven Street, and I would be obliged to you if you would transmit to him £350. A draft on your *own banker* to bearer would be quite safe. He speaks very sanguinely of his plan to make himself independent, but of this we must see our way more clearly before we can credit it. . . .

I wish I saw my way to some arrangement for Huskisson, but there is no *light* at present. I wrote to sound Sidmouth about his *friend*,<sup>2</sup> but I should say that by his answer he appeared more *tenacious* of office & situation for himself & friend than he was before. . . .

We must make the Duke of W[ellington] take care of himself when he returns home. He has had a strong warning which comes upon every man a little sooner or later when he approaches or is past fifty, and he will feel himself compel'd to alter his mode of life. It is most unlucky that he should not find in domestick comforts a proportion at least of that repose he now so much wants.

*Ibid., Coombe Wood, 27 December 1822. Private & confidential.*—I am sorry to say that neither Canning, the Duke of Wellington, nor Ch[arles] Ellis have made the least impression upon Huskisson. No man can have behaved worse.

The Duke is gone to Brighton today. I shall write to the King about the *arrangement* tomorrow. I am determined not to *advise* Huskisson being brought into the Cabinet. I shall state to the King the progress of the whole business and leave the question of Cabinet for Huskisson to his My's unfetter'd

<sup>1</sup> See *George IV corresp.*, iii. 7–8.

<sup>2</sup> Vansittart.

decision. Every other person has behaved as well as possible, and I own I am surprised that anyone should desire to come into a Cabinet against the feeling & inclination of his colleagues.

Keep all this for the present to yourself.<sup>1</sup>

*Ibid.*, Coombe Wood, 29 December 1822. *Private & confidential*.— . . . I shall certainly keep to myself all you say about the Duke. I can understand some of his feelings, but I think when we come to talk matters over with him he will be better reconciled to many things, at least, which have passed; the truth is, he is rather *more continental* than we either are or ought to be *permanently*. I say *permanently*, because from circumstances we were brought into a course which was quite right at the time, but to which (with our different prejudices and form of Govt.) we never could expect to adhere indefinitely.

I am glad to find Van. is to see Lord Sidmouth before he comes here. Lord S. will be very decided about his taking the Duchy, and nearly as much so about his not having a peerage, which honor he thinks would only lower & discredit him. . . .

*Ibid.*, Coombe Wood, 30 December 1822. *Private & confidential*.—I am much obliged to you for your letters. The one you wrote to Huskisson is quite right.

It is of the utmost importance that the *whole secret* as to the arrangement should still be *sacred*. You are mistaken in supposing that the Duke of W[ellington] was to discuss the matter with the King. He was to report to us as to the King's state of mind and general disposition to the Govt. This he has done, & it is very favourable, but he strongly urges that the proposition should not be made to the King till after the return of Sir Wm. Knighton, which will not be before Thursday next. I have agreed to this, but I am not without some fears that the intention may transpire. I hope this will not be the case; if it was, it might be fatal to the whole plan.

I think Van. ought now to be quite satisfied. I could not agree to a remainder to collaterals, & both Lord Sidmouth & Canning thought me quite

<sup>1</sup> Bragge-Bathurst was now induced to resign the chancellorship of the duchy of Lancaster; Vansittart succeeded him and was consoled with a peerage; Robinson succeeded Vansittart as chancellor of the exchequer, Huskisson took Robinson's place as president of the board of trade and treasurer of the navy, but remained out of the cabinet until November 1823; Arbuthnot succeeded Huskisson as first commissioner of woods and forests, and J. C. Herries became joint secretary of the treasury. It was Liverpool, not the king, who kept Huskisson out of the cabinet at this time, but promised that he should be brought in in twelve months' time, or earlier, in the event of a vacancy. To this Huskisson reluctantly agreed.

Vansittart wrote to Arbuthnot, apparently on the 27th: 'You took so kind a part in the arrangement of the mode of my retirement that I owe it to you to let you know that it [is] likely to [be] settled in a satisfactory manner. Lord L. has consented (though I confess not very willingly) to propose to the King to call me up to the H[ouse] of Peers but decidedly objected to ask for any collateral remainders. Though this determination destroys its value as a family honor or at least greatly reduces it, yet as an honorable retreat from the H. of C. it fully answers the purposes of comfort, & I cannot be insensible of its value as a distinguished mark of the King's approbation of my services. It also offers a probability of my remaining connected with the Govt longer than by any other arrangement. It remains however to be seen what H M will think of this proposition as well as of the plan in general. Ld. L[iverpool] is to write to him tomorrow.'

right. It is always objectionable, & he has no relation sufficiently *marked* to account for it. The King would *certainly* have opposed it, & the chance of success with the other (which I think by no means certain, & which, as I told Van., I would *strongly advise*, but could not *press* if opposed) is my being able in the first instance to say that this was not *intended*, & that the peerage was probably only one for life.

I am more provoked with Huskisson than I can tell you. I cannot conceive anything [in] worse taste than a man endeavouring to *force* himself into a Cabinet against the wishes of the King & his own friends. *Entre nous* my hope is that the King will object to it, saying that he will not oppose Huskisson coming into the Cabinet hereafter when the numbers are reduced.<sup>1</sup>

### 33. The Duke of Wellington's Memorandum.

[? c. *January* 1823].—In the course of the discussions last year upon the subject of a provision to be made for the Marquis of Hastings on his return from his Govt. in India, the appointment of his Lordship to the Embassy at Vienna was among other arrangements under consideration.

Lord Londonderry had long intended that Sir Henry Wellesley should succeed Lord Stewart in that situation, & he had repeatedly desired me to assure Sir Henry Wellesley, and he had himself more than once assured him of this intention.

Upon the occasion above referred to of the arrangement to be made for the employment of the Marquis of Hastings, Lord Londonderry again assured me that it should not interfere with the appointment of Sir Henry Wellesley to the Embassy at Vienna whenever it should become vacant; and he told me that he would take the King's pleasure upon the subject. I believe he likewise spoke to Mr Arbuthnot upon the subject, but I don't doubt that H.M. will recollect if Lord Londonderry did take his pleasure upon this arrangement.<sup>2</sup>

### 34. The Earl of Liverpool \* to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Fife House, 6 January 1823. Most secret & confidential.*—You will be glad to hear that nothing can have been more kind than the King's acquiescence in my proposed arrangements, both as to substance & manner. His letter was most flattering to Vansittart, readily consenting to call him to the House of Lords. He entirely approves under all the circumstances, of the arrangement for Robinson; has no objection to Huskisson for the Presidency of the Board of Trade; leaves the question of the Cabinet to me, but renewing his opinion as to the expediency of reducing the numbers.

I should further add that he has since most entirely approved of your succeeding Huskisson in the office of Woods & Forests, and expressed himself, as I will show you, most deeply interested about you.

Upon receiving this communication I had a full conversation with Can-

<sup>1</sup> Its numbers had risen from 12, on its formation in 1812, to 15.

<sup>2</sup> Sir Henry Wellesley succeeded Londonderry as ambassador at Vienna. Hastings was appointed governor and commander-in-chief of Malta.

ning as to Huskisson, & we both agreed that after the expression of the King's sentiments, he ought to wave the Cabinet at least for the present—and Canning thought that he might be persuaded to do so, if I gave him an assurance that he should be admitted as a member of it in a twelvemonth, or sooner, if the numbers of the Cabinet were reduced. Canning has heard from him this morning in reply, & he has assented, not with a very good grace, but still he has assented—and I have written to the King to say so.

The whole arrangement may therefore be now considered as concluded except as far as regards your office of Secy. to the Treasury. I still, however, wish the secret to be kept for a few days.

I have written to Lords Bathurst & Harrowby, & am going to write to the Chancellor, & will to Westmorland tomorrow or next day. . . .

### 35. George Canning to Charles Arbuthnot.

*F.O. 10 January 1823. Private & confidential.*—You will have heard from Ld. L[iverpool] that I succeeded with H[uskisson] at last, & that the consent to wave the claim for the present (though not perhaps with the best grace) on my entreaty, & on promise of future indemnification.

But out of one difficulty we have fallen into another—not unforeseen, but I am sorry to say, insurmountable, if a way cannot be found to put it by.

The person to whom we framed the kind letter for L. at the desk where I am now writing—will not submit to remain where he is—and prefers being nowhere. L. will shew you the correspondence when you come to town. I have seen him (W[allace]) this morning : & have exhausted all my powers of persuasion in vain, the more hopelessly indeed as there is nothing of ill temper, no complaint of unkindness—but only a fixed determination to go out rather than to be placed in that direct relation to H. (H. little thought, by the way, when he was kicking so sturdily, how other people's feelings were to be tried.) Now L. feels very deeply the appearance of harshness to so old a friend as W. He feels too the peculiar injustice of displacing him at a moment when he has been rendering eminent publick service. He sees but one way of avoiding this at present ; & that one way he desires me to break to you.

It is that you would consent to let W. take the succession to H. *for the present*, you taking the B. of T. with H. but *keeping your present house*<sup>1</sup> : & with a direct & positive understanding that whenever the Mint can be vacated (or of course any similar office, but for the Mint it is hoped the D. of W. might help) you shall have your choice either of *that* or of recovering your inheritance from W.

Now I am to beg of you to consider this suggestion—& let L. have your answer on Monday. It will be but for one session in all human probability.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> His official residence in Downing Street.

<sup>2</sup> Wallace, vice-president of the board of trade, considered that his claims to the presidentship were superior to Huskisson's. Wallace had been chiefly responsible for the modification of the navigation laws in 1822 and for the revision of the commercial code. He, Canning and Liverpool were at Christ Church together. Later in the year Lord Maryborough was persuaded to resign his office of master of the mint, to which Wallace was appointed.

## 36. Charles Arbuthnot to the Earl of Liverpool.

*Woodford, 12 January 1823. Private & Confidential.*—It will not surprise you that the letter which I yesterday received from Canning shd. have caused me great distress, & unfortunately I have had to bear the shock when, on account of illness, I am weakened both in mind and body.

It has been my duty, in the long & close connexion which I have had with you, to forward many objects of the Govt. by preaching lessons of patience & forbearance; and knowing as I do how kindly you interest yourself in all that concerns me, I hasten to assure you that now that my turn for showing an accommodating temper has come, I will cheerfully practise what, in speaking to others, I have so often endeavoured to inculcate. But I am sure that you will feel the propriety of my opening myself to you on the present occasion without reserve; & tho' in discussing one's own claims & merits it may be difficult to use correct expressions, yet my effort will be to be fair & unprejudiced. At all events I shall meet, I am sure, with your indulgence; & while you are reading what I write, you will make due allowance for the extreme embarrassment which I feel.

Without other interest than that which I had created for myself, I had in early life the good fortune to attain the highest honours in the Foreign line; & here it is grateful to me to observe that you were the chief instrument of my success. It was thought by many of my friends that I was unwise in consenting afterwards to be Secretary of the Treasury. I did not, however, so much consider the agreeableness of the office, as the means it gave me of endeavouring to be useful; & I was averse to the notion of retiring upon a pension in the prime of life. It is not for me to say whether I have been useful. No one however but myself can tell how trying at times my duties have been, & when my mind has been almost ready to break with vexation I have comforted myself with feeling that to you I had devoted my best & most strenuous exertions.

It has not been from vanity that I have entered into this short history of my public life. I have been impelled to it by a feeling that if in all that has been intrusted to my care I have ever had any merit at all, I must by this time have gained that degree of character & station which could not be upheld if I were now to lower myself in the public mind. Wallace feels that it would be a degradation to him were he to be the Vice-President under Huskisson. I compare myself with no one. 'My utility has been the best that I could make it; & often used Lord Londonderry to say that altho' I might for the accommodation of the Govt. consent to postpone my claims to those of Huskisson, yet ever should he declare that, worn out as I had been in the anxious & multifarious duties of my present office, I was the person who had the first demand upon the Government. It will not therefore be surprising if I also, as well as Wallace, have a great repugnance to the official connexion with Huskisson which is contemplated. He & I are on the most cordial terms. I felt it was no offence once to tell him, that should he ever become Chr. of the Exr. I would not be Secy. of the Treasury under him; & with the same sincerity I

could now let him know that united with him at the Board of Trade, I could not but think that I was in in [*sic*] a false position. But for a time, & I look upon this as a merely temporary arrangement, my embarrassment may be diminished by my refraining wholly and altogether from sharing with Huskisson the responsibility of the office. The general voice of all men proclaims Huskisson as eminently qualified to be President of the Board of Trade. His claim to the Cabinet is grounded upon the responsibility which that department will give him; & were I to take some share in the minor duties of the office, unpractised as I have been in everything that relates to it, I should experience no other change than that of becoming Huskisson's secretary instead of yours. Wallace in this respect, had he consented to remain, would have had an advantage which I possess not. He had laboured so well and so zealously that Robinson had become the cypher; & so fair has been the fame that he has acquired, that not even Huskisson himself would eclipse him. Indeed it is obvious that Wallace for this very reason could remain where he is without degradation; while I on the contrary cannot but feel that my appointment being simultaneous with that of Huskisson, I shall be sadly lowered from being the mere inheritor of Wallace's office but not of his station.

But if in order to prevent the mischief which would arise from Wallace's retirement, & if for the purpose of relieving you from painful difficulty and embarrassment, I at once and in perfect good humour consent to the arrangement which Canning's letter proposes, I must still however call strongly upon your friendship to share my feelings, & to go along with me in the earnest wish I have that I may not linger at the Board of Trade, & that during the time I must remain there, I may not be called upon to share the labours with Huskisson, when all the honours & all the responsibility must *perforce* belong to him.

I should, on the contrary, wish it to be generally understood that not having strength or spirits to bear longer the drudgery of the Treasury, & it not being possible at the present to provide me with a proper office, it had been an object to preserve me in link with the Govt., & that altho' I should be no gainer by it (with the exception of the official house) I was for a time to be Vice-President of the Board of Trade instead of retiring upon my pension.

There is another point to which Canning in his letter alludes, and upon this I must write to you. I am referring to the office which Lord Maryborough holds, & to the idea which Canning entertains that perhaps the Duke of Wellington may be able to assist us in endeavouring to remove him from it. I am not sure whether Canning knows, as you & I do, that last year the Duke did readily upon this same subject lend his aid; but the consequence was that Ld. Maryborough quarrelled with the Duke at the time, & that he has never forgiven him since. The Duke, as I told you in a former letter, has been with me; & of course I showed him Canning's letter. In respect to that part of it which relates to himself, he immediately declared that he could not venture to say a word to his brother, & that indeed his further interference would do harm instead of good. If it should be thought right to make any communication to Ld. Maryborough, it will, of course, be easy to form a

suitable arrangement for me, either by the Mint or by the Woods & Forests ; but intimate as I have been through life with all the Wellesleys, I could not with honour or with proper feeling be the instigator of a measure which would benefit me at Lord Maryborough's expence. If on public grounds he shall have to change his office, the case would be quite different.

I have now, my dear Ld. Liverpool, gone thro' my long detail I have expressed myself with freedom, for I should have been dishonest had I done otherwise. I have never, during our long & confidential connexion, overwhelmed you with professions, for you best could judge whether I tried to serve you with zeal & friendship ; and now when I am called upon to give the proof whether in my intercourse with you I have had an overweening care for my own interests, it gives me something like joy to know that my own grievous disappointment has not improperly biassed my mind, but that on the contrary I have rather been willing to be placed for a time in a false position, than to see you involved in what, I am aware, would have been a most painful embarrassment.

I have not been insensible to what you must have undergone when you could not even prevail upon yourself to write to me. It was necessary that I should know how things stood ; but I am sure it has cost you much to let the intelligence be conveyed to me.

I have lost no time in trying to set your mind at ease, and also in begging you to be assured that, altho' I hope *my time of probation* may not be long, you shall see me taking my share in the arrangement with the most perfect cordiality & good humour.

### 37. William Huskisson to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Eartham, 12 January 1823. Private & confidential.*—I received on Friday your letter of the 8th, which conveyed to me the first information that you were to be my successor. Yesterday, however, I had a letter from Canning, which makes it again doubtful whether *that* will be the relation in which you and I may stand to one another in the pending changes.

All that I have time, by this post, to say upon the subject of this new opening (and I am sure you will believe that I say it in all sincerity) is, that, looking to the Board of Trade, insulated from all other considerations, it would be to me personally the greatest satisfaction that we should be there together ; and in that contingency I have no doubt that we should so divide the business of the Department as to make it comfortable to each other. At least you should find in me every disposition to lighten its labours to you as much as possible. But my thoughts since Friday have been wandering in a different direction, as well for you as for myself. Canning will probably state to you the particulars which I have not leisure to enter upon. It is time, however, that the whole matter should, in some shape, be brought to a close. That I may not occasion unnecessary delay, I will be in town by three o'clock on Tuesday. I cannot be there sooner, as I have a report to make to our Quarter Sessions tomorrow on Tread Wheels, and the discipline of our



House of Correction ; and it is to settle this report with my colleagues on the Committee, that I must now postpone, till we meet, touching on the other topics of your letter.

### 38. George Canning to Charles Arbuthnot.

G[loucester] L[odge], 13 January 1823. *Private*.—I am so far from having gotten a *good* mover & seconder, that I have not yet either, & know not where to look for either. Ld. Chandos, for whom Wynn answered—is not to be had. To Daly, whom Husk[isso]n suggested, Peel discourages an application—thinking that he is too agriculturally distressed. In short, I must be helped in this matter : for the business of my own department has been so overwhelming, that I really have not had time to think of anything internal.

There is no use in touching upon the other subject of your letter—as H[uskisso]n is to be in town tomorrow, & you on Wednesday. I am sick of the whole subject, God knows.

### 39. Earl Bathurst to Charles Arbuthnot.

Cirencester, 15 January 1823.— . . . On the proposal made to you, I gave my opinion yesterday. I do not think that being the Vice President, you should consider yourself as the *Secretary* to Mr Huskisson, as the D. of W[ellington] apprehends, but you are certainly *second* at the Board, & you are not in the position you ought to be. Do, however, think twice before you avow you intend to accept it without doing any of the duties attach'd to it. I had much rather you should take your pension. It would be the more dignified & intelligible, & save you many an attack about the house.

I am amazed at what you say of the little attention shewn to the D. of W. You will not act the part, I will not say of Liverpool's friend, but even of an honest man, if you do not apprise him of the Duke's feelings on the proposed repeal of the Enlisting Bill, a project which must break up the Government if carried into effect.<sup>1</sup> I am more & more convinc'd of what I hinted to you when I saw you in London, that there is some secret understanding with Holland House.<sup>2</sup>

### 40. George Canning to Charles Arbuthnot.

G[loucester] L[odge], 15 January 1823. *Private*.—Two persons have been suggested to me as movers, & one as seconder. About the latter—Sir Henry Hardinge—I write to the Duke of Wellington. The two former are Mr Hill the member for Salop, & Mr Childe, who would have been so, if he could.

<sup>1</sup> On 16 April Lord Althorp brought forward a motion for the repeal of the Foreign Enlistment Act, so that British subjects might fight in Spain against the French invaders. Canning opposed it on the ground that it would be a violation of British neutrality, and it was defeated by 216 to 110.

<sup>2</sup> That is, between Canning and the opposition. See Bathurst's letter to Wellington (2 January) in *W.N.D.*, ii. 6.

Mr Hill I perhaps could get at thro' the Staffords, but there is one objection to him—that if Sir H. Hardinge seconds, both would be in the army. Mr Holmes tells me that *you* are all powerful with Mr Childe; & that Mr Childe is a person of more than ordinary capacity. If you concur in thinking him a fit person, will you try him for me?

*Ibid.*, G[loucester] L[odge], 17 January 1823.—I wrote to the D. of W[elington] on Wednesday or Thursday to beg him to canvass *Sir Henry Hardinge* for a seconder. I presume my letter had missed him, for he did not say anything to me upon the subject when he was here yesterday; & unluckily I forgot to mention it to him. Do not you think that he would do very well?—& that his connection with Ld. L[ondonderry]'s family would be a great recommendation? <sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, if Ld. Henry Ch[olmondeley] <sup>2</sup> would accept, that, I dare say, would be still better. But is not his rank an objection to his seconding, when an untitled commoner moves? I would help him to what he has to say, with all my heart. Bankes would not do, I think. High Protestant, & reputed crim. con. together would be inconvenient. Ward, I think, would not have undertaken it, in my absence from the House.

I have not seen what you wrote to Ld. L[iverpool]. He had left me before your servant arrived.<sup>3</sup>

#### 41. The Earl of Liverpool to the Duke of Wellington.

*Fife House, 17 January 1823. Private.*—I have written to Arbuthnot to say that I have taken upon myself to decide that the arrangement should remain as approved by the King. I deeply regret that he should have felt the whole business so severely. I only wished to have it discuss'd quietly, and was resolved not to force his feelings upon it. I am now only anxious that as far as possible you would quiet his mind & let there be no further discussion upon it. I think he had better come to town than return home. He will only brood over all this in the country, particularly if he is alone with his family. . . .

#### 42. The Earl of Liverpool\* to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Fife House, 17 January 1823. Most secret & confidential.*—I can assure you that if I had had the least idea that the proposal which was made to you would have given you the pain which I see it has really occasioned in your mind, no consideration would have ever induced me to have authorized it. I was only hurt that in your first letter you could have supposed that I would sanction anything which could degrade or lower you in the world.

<sup>1</sup> Sir Henry Hardinge's wife was Lord Londonderry's sister.

<sup>2</sup> The second son of the first marquess of Cholmondeley. M.P. for Castle Rising. He married Arbuthnot's daughter Marcia in 1825 (1800–84) and succeeded his elder brother as third marquess in 1870.

<sup>3</sup> The Address was moved by Childe and seconded by J. B. Wildman, M.P. for Colchester.

I think myself a better judge on such a subject as that of political office than most men, & I never was more satisfied on any point than that this would not be the effect of the proposed arrangement. I told, however, Canning, & I wrote to the Duke of Wellington in the very first instance to say that I would in no way press it in opposition to your feelings, & it would make me miserable, I assure you, if I could think that you had, for the purpose of accommodating me, done anything which you would afterwards feel as derogatory to your character, or which would be disapproved of by your friends or connexions.

I have taken upon myself, therefore, to decide that the arrangement shall remain as approved by the King. I have no certainty that Wallace would have taken the Woods and Forests, and as little that the King would approve of him in that particular office. But however this may be, I only wish to spare you & myself all further discussion upon the subject. I must do the best I can for Wallace hereafter if he perseveres, as I have doubt he will, in resigning the Vice-Presidency of the Board of Trade at this time.

Let me therefore beg of you to set your mind entirely at ease on this whole subject. My only wish was to have discussed it quietly with you, & then to have left it completely to your own decision.

Your absence from town was unfortunate at such a moment, or the point might otherwise have been brought to a conclusion in a few hours. I must just say with respect to Naples, Canning mentioned it in great kindness as an idea that had come across his mind, but the Duke will do me the justice to say I scouted it immediately . . .<sup>1</sup>

#### 43. Earl Bathurst to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Dropmore, 19 January 1823.*—I shall very much reproach myself if you give up the advantage of the house on any representation of mine, particularly as to the manner in which it may be consider'd in the H. of Commons, of which I can really know nothing. There would certainly be no objection to your continuing in it for some months to come, as a matter of private arrangement between you & your successor, but it is to the continued occupation of it, until you had another office, to which I thought objection would be made. I still feel a very great objection to your accepting the office, with an intention of not discharging the duties belonging to it. I am sure that an arrangement might be made between you & Huskisson, which might leave you with a separate department. For example, all the Colonial Bills are refer'd from my office to the B. of Trade, to report to the Council whether the King should give his assent to them. If you undertook this, great advantage would arise in a more regular dispatch of that branch of the duties of the Board, & you would, I think, not dislike to be in that immediate relation with my office. I mention this for the purpose of shewing that you might act in a great measure in a department of your own, altho' you might consult Huskisson on any part respecting the effect which any of the Bills might

<sup>1</sup> William Richard Hamilton was then minister to the Neapolitan court.

have upon the trade of the colony, where you entertain'd any doubts, or in cases which you thought might bear upon the general system, in the same manner as he will consult you upon any of the matters which he may more immediately undertake. . . .

Wallace, I presume, feels, what you need not do, that as he has been long second at the Board, his being for a second time superseded by a commoner is a degradation; this I recollect was his chief feeling when Robinson was appointed,<sup>1</sup> & I believe that something of understanding was given that it would not be repeated. . . .

*Ibid.*, Stanhope Street, 21 January 1823.—Liverpool's letter is certainly a sore one, but I do not think intentionally an unkind one. He seems to feel deeply that anything unpleasant has past between you; & I cannot help flattering myself that by a little perseverance all will go on well again. It will not be either for your credit or his that you should break off a confidential intercourse of so long a standing. The only doubt I have is whether you had not better just write *one line* to say (without *entering into particulars*) that you would never have made any communication on the subject except to the D. of Wellington unless you had understood it to have been his wish for you to have consulted your friends, but that you now lament having done so, as it seems to have given him pain. I quite enter into all your feelings, but do not think that he means unkindly by you in the letter which he has written, for depend upon it, he would not have written it if he had felt indifferently towards you. I do not mean to begin the subject with him unless he gives occasion to do so, but if you have a wish to the contrary, I will begin.

*Ibid.*, Stanhope Street, 23 January 1823—I will certainly not advert in my conversation with the Duke to what you have said of his intention to withdraw, if the Enlisting Bill should be repeal'd; but I trust it will not be wrong to ask him what has made him apprehend that there is such an intention.

I am very sorry you have not been able to persuade the Duke to abstain from advice to his brother.

#### 44. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Fife House*, 2 October 1823. *Most secret*.—I found your letter and its enclosures upon my arrival in town. I was much pleased with Col Shawe's, & believe the account he gives of his master <sup>2</sup> &c (with some little exaggeration) is correct. The truth is, he is a great *compound*, and if one is to have the use of him it must be by making as little as possible of some of his absurdities. We have known him for thirty years. The acquaintance of Peel & Goulburn has been but recent, & they cannot therefore see as well as us that a man may be wise in some things & most foolish in others. I will hope, however, that by the aid of Shawe, all will go well. It is most essential that it should. Goulburn is not only *invaluable* in himself, but he is just the man to be Secy. to Lord Wellesley. His purity & correctness of character make amends for the defects of the other, and this, Shawe should be made by you to feel. . . .

<sup>1</sup> In 1818.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Wellesley. Shawe was his private secretary.

You may rely upon my discretion as to the Duke of Buckingham. I cannot bear the idea of the Cabinet being a collection of little *knots of parties*. Independent of this you may rely upon it the King will never readily agree to his being brought into the Cabinet unless a *decidedly Cabinet office* should become vacant, and in this he is quite right.<sup>1</sup>

#### 45. Charles Arbuthnot to Lord Liverpool.<sup>2</sup>

[c. 7 October 1823] *Draft*—Altho' the King sent for me to Windsor for the purpose of speaking to me about the improvements & the purchases which he is so anxious to make in that neighbourhood, yet when I was with him he took the opportunity, as you know he has done on former occasions, to communicate with me upon other topics, & upon some which more particularly relate to his own person & Government. I am not sorry that he has done so. It enabled me whilst I remained at Windsor to speak both to him & to Sir W. Knighton in a manner wch., I trust, may be beneficial; and also it now gives me the power of conveying information to you which you may, I should hope, turn to good account. But my object being to do you all the good in my power, it will be quite necessary that I should express myself to you, not only with the most perfect freedom; but I must also enter fully and fairly into subjects of a personal & delicate nature, & upon which I should remain in silence were it not for the desire of serving you. I am confident, therefore, that you will keep what I write exclusively for yourself, & that you will never allow it to be known to any human being

<sup>1</sup> Since 1821, when his 'connection' joined the government, the duke, dissatisfied with his new title, had been pressing his claims to office.

<sup>2</sup> Arbuthnot submitted his draft to Wellington, who amended it very extensively. The paragraphs marked \* were scored through, in pencil, by the duke, who suggested the substitution of the paragraphs in the right-hand column.

that you have recd. the information from me which I am now going to communicate.

\* You have two most extraordinary persons to deal with. I mean the King & Sir Wm. Knighton. These two persons are now travelling in the same course, but they are not influenced by the same motives. Sir Wm. Knighton had wished to be indebted to you for the greatest favour wch., with his turn of mind, & in his situation, you could bestow upon him<sup>1</sup>; but he was at the same time prepared to harbour against you the bitterest resentment if the favour he sought for was refused. From Sir Wm. Knighton, therefore, it is right you should know that as long as his mind shall continue to writhe under mortification & disappointment, you must expect all the disservice & all the injury that he can inflict. The King, on the other hand, harbours no ill will against you, & is at present in as perfect a state of good humour towards you & towards the Government generally, as I recollect ever to have seen him. But here I must observe to you that you are not the less in a critical situation because the King is at this moment actuated by no angry feelings. I should say, on the contrary, that on this very account you have the more to apprehend & the more to guard against; for did not the means in this manner exist of apprising you of what is passing in the King's mind, an explosion might take place without yr. having been led to expect it by the sourness or ill humour of his conduct.

\* Whether it was known to yourself or not I cannot at present recollect; but I remember well that, putting

The K. is not out of temper with any act of his Govt., but he is not satisfied with the existing state of things, & he is prepared to make a change upon the occurrence of any event which can afford an excuse for it, of which change you would be the sacrifice. This state of mind is produced by two circumstances, the irritation almost to insanity of Sir W. in consequence of his disappointment in obtaining his object; and the influence which Mr C. is supposed to have over your mind.

Sir W. Knighton certainly rendered the Govt. every service in his power during some time—but from the period at which this favour was refused him he has not only ceased to render such service, but he has been inclined to seize every opportunity of doing him (Lord L.) a disservice.

I don't think it is strictly true that the K. harbours no ill-will against Lord L. He is [in] perfect good humor with the Govt. & its measures, & with Lord L. But he hates him, & he is anxious to get rid of him, as well for this reason as because he thinks him under the influence of Canning. Soreness & ill temper will always precede the explosion. That which excites at present is a desire to find cause for blame, and a successor for Lord L. If the successor was found, the *former quarrel* would follow even if there was no cause for blame. But the cause for blame is sought for in order, through that cause, to find a person willing to be the successor

<sup>1</sup> He wanted to be a privy councillor

aside, more perhaps than you were aware of, all his own personal objections against Canning, the King dreaded his admission into the Cabinet from the fear he had lest his influence should be great with you. The King now thinks that those fears have been realised. This he not only thinks, but it would not be in the power of words to eradicate the notion from his mind. He never did like Canning, & my belief is that he never will like him; but I am sure I am not going too far in saying that he wd. far rather make Canning his Prime Minister rather than continue to have the conviction that the real power is already vested in him, while the name alone remains with you. You may be able to tell better than I can what it is that has impressed this feeling upon the King; but I am sure, from the way in which he spoke of it to me that for a long time he has been thinking of nothing else; & that to put an end to what he is so convinced exists, he wd. most readily risk the very existence of his Government. Do not, however, imagine that he wants to get rid of you. He wants, on the contrary, to have you his Minister, as Mr. Pitt was at one time the Minister of his father; but if he cannot effect this, & if circumstances should still rivet him in the belief that from you he is always hearing Canning's sentiments, & not your own, he would *faute de mieux* rather go to Canning & put himself entirely in his hands, than allow him, as I said before, to have the reality of the power, tho' not the name of it. Could you have overheard all that he said to me of Canning, you wd. not suppose that he had formed a more favourable

I should say that the King is provoked and annoyed at the existence of this influence. He conceived he felt the ill effects of it heretofore. But although he does not complain of those effects now, he does of the influence as a disgrace to the Govt. at large, to Lord L. and to each of the Ministers; & I think he talks of it, to me, at least, to provoke me to resist it.

This is all right & might be put in a stronger point of view. The K.

opinion of him ; but he worked himself up to say to me that Canning, with all his faults, had at least the merit of having unbounded attachment to his friends, & that, should he ever be driven to have recourse to him, every species of personal attention wd. be received from him.

\* In all that I have as yet said, no proof has been given that I have taken a correct view of what is passing in the King's mind ; but I will now mention one or two things which I heard from him, and then I would leave it to you to draw the inference.

When you were last with the King, you put into his hands a letter which you had received from the Chancellor ; & you desired that he wd. read it with attention, & that, the letter being very long, you wished him to defer the reading of it until he was alone. You made, as the King told me, no comment upon the letter ; but you only begged that, when read, it might be sealed up & returned in a box to you.

In what light the King first considered the letter, I have not had the power of knowing : certain, however, it is that when he & Knighton had read it over together, the thought struck one or both, or there was a determination to entertain the thought, or pretended to have the <sup>1</sup> thought, that the Chancellor was differing with you upon the legal points to which the letter related, & that it had been your intention to take that mode of letting the King know that this difference existed. I must not conceal from you that Knighton seems to have seized gladly this opportunity of gratifying his

thinks that if Canning was his Minister there would be no difficulty respecting his personal objects in buildings, purchases, &c. upon which another Minister would be in daily contact with him.

<sup>1</sup> The duke deleted this portion of the sentence, substituting in pencil, 'Upon reading the letter the K. & Knighton . . .'



resentment. I have not the least doubt that it wd. have pleased him if he had caused the King <sup>1</sup> to write an offensive letter to you, & a most flattering and affectionate one to the Chancellor. But the measure resorted to by the King & Knighton destroyed this scheme, & for the present, at least, put an end to whatever plans <sup>2</sup> may have been in Knighton's head. It was determined to show the Chancellor's letter to the Duke of Wellington, to ask his opinion upon it, & to tell him in what manner the King meant to treat it. All this was done the week before I was at Windsor; & the Duke, after reading the Chancellor's letter, pointed out to the King, & made him feel <sup>3</sup> that there was not a single word in it which could bear the construction which there had been an endeavour to put upon it. The Duke, in short, showed word by word that the Chancellor's letter to you had been a most friendly one; & that there had been no other object in writing it than to let you have clearly before you all the bearings & all the difficulties of the case. A full account was given to me by the King of the whole of this; [& what is the most material for you to know, that full & ever full of the idea that you have delegated all your authority & all your influence to Canning, & resolved if it be in his power, by foul means if fair ones shd. fail him, to put an end to this state of things, his] <sup>5</sup> object (as indeed the King plainly let out to me) in consulting the Duke of Wellington was to ascer-

The Duke went so far as to tell the King that if you had heard of the reports that there was a difference between the Lord Chancellor & you, & imagined the K. had heard those reports, or those that the Chancellor was unwell, you had probably shewn H.M. the letter, to prove to him that there was no foundation for such stories <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wellington deleted these words, substituting, 'The intention was . . .'

<sup>2</sup> 'and machinations', scored out by Arbuthnot

<sup>3</sup> Wellington substituted. 'pointed out to the King and to Knighton, & made them both feel . . .'

<sup>4</sup> This, the duke suggested, should be inserted after 'the difficulties of the case'.

<sup>5</sup> Wellington scored out the words in square brackets, and went on, 'The object . . .'

tain whether he wd. be available in the event of its being necessary to decide between the Chancellor & you.

\* It would be leading me into too great lengths were I to attempt to repeat all that I heard from the King upon this occasion. He gave me the story of the Chancellor's letter, & he told me many other things for the purpose of letting me know that he was driven, if I may so say, to his wits' ends by the annoyance which he suffered under the strong feeling he has that you have allowed Canning to usurp all the power which ought to belong to you as his First Minister.

The Duke [had already, by his own honourable conduct & by the rectitude of his mind,<sup>1</sup>] thus prevented an explosion which had not his opinion been asked must have burst forth, but an opportunity was given to me of repeating to the King words which I had heard from the Duke, & of telling him that with *his very heart's blood* the Duke would uphold and support *your* Government. It had happened on the very day before that the Duke  $\lambda$  had said to me that, adhering as he always did to his determination never to force anything upon the King which he might feel ought not to be forced, he was, on the other hand, equally determined to support *you* with his heart's blood; & I felt that the opportunity of telling this to the King was a most happy one.

You ought however to know what were the King's remarks when I said this to him. He had observed, he told me, that some such feeling was in the Duke's mind; that far was it from his wish to part with you if you

The K., if he had been in his ordinary state of mind, and if Sir W. K. had not done everything in his power to mislead him, could not have so misunderstood the Chancellor's letter, nor could K. have taken the erroneous view he did of the Chancellor's letter, if he likewise had not been almost mad with rage & disappointment. The whole transaction shews what the state of mind of these men is, and what they will do in order to overturn what exists.

$\lambda$  on our way from Hatfield to Windsor<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wellington deleted these words in brackets.

<sup>2</sup> The duke scored out his own marginal addition.

would but enable him to keep you ; but that it was more than he could bear to have all your rightful influence delegated to Canning, & that it behoved the Duke to look well to himself & to his own interests, for that a Minister he would have, who wd. assert his rights as Minister, & that, detesting Canning as he did, he might & be forced to recur to him, & to place him avowedly in the situation which did not now belong to him, but which he had contrived to usurp.

\* I have thought it better to let you know the King's own state of mind, as I found it at least, before I communicated to you all that, on the day before, I had heard from the Duke of Wellington. The Duke had written to desire that I would call for him at Hatfield, that we might go together to Windsor. As we were going along, the Duke told me everything that I afterwards heard from the King ; & all that I heard from the one was precisely what I heard from the other. The Duke said that the King was not at all [*in ill-humour with you*] ; <sup>2</sup> but that on the contrary his object was to see you in the exercise of greater, & indeed of full power, as Prime Minister ; that despairing of this, it was obvious that he was looking about to see what could be done were you & he to part ; and that notwithstanding the very great abuse of Canning in which it is his delight to indulge, he wd. far rather abandon himself entirely to him than continue to see him invested with all the power of a First Minister without the name. The Duke was

& nevertheless

I went with the Duke from Hatfield to Windsor, having called for him by his desire, & he told me everything regarding the Chancellor's letter precisely in the same terms as were afterwards used to me by the King.<sup>1</sup>

The Duke agrees with me that the K. makes no complaint of you excepting that you are under the influence of Mr C. Upon this he feels sore & provoked, & he wishes to irritate others upon it. He feels not only that he has not the advantage of your talents in your situation, but that he has all the mischief of Mr C.'s measures without the check upon those measures which would result from his feeling himself responsible for them. He does not like Mr C. more than he did. But he would prefer to have him for his Minister to the existing state of things, because

<sup>1</sup> The duke scored out his own words, later countermanding it with *stet*.

<sup>2</sup> The duke substituted for his, 'out of temper with any act of the Govt.'. He must have scored out this paragraph subsequently.

not blind to *the attempt* wch. was made upon him by the King; but to you it wd. be quite needless to say that he spurned every such notion from him, & that in him you will ever find a most steady & strenuous supporter.

I will add that in him you will ever find a most zealous & confidential friend, if you like to have him as such; but anxious as I ever have been to see in such safe, in such honourable, & in such powerful hands as you wd. at all times find the Duke's to be, it did give me very great pain when you did not seem to meet his confidential communication from Cheltenham in the way that I hoped & that he expected. He observed to me that when the question arose whether Canning was to be brought into the Cabinet, he & you at Coombe discussed the whole subject, & discussed Canning himself, taking into account all the *pros* & all the *cons* in his character & disposition; & that he (the Duke), still wishing to maintain the same confidential intercourse with you, had not only written to you from Cheltenham quite with an open heart, but had even sent to you the copy of what he was writing to Canning. You did not write to him in answer, but you wrote to Canning, & as the Duke inferred from what passed, it became known to Canning that you had received the communication of the letter which had been sent to him. This I must own to you wounded the Duke sorely. It wd. be idle of me now to refer [to] it, had I not the knowledge that in what has recently been passing at Windsor, the Duke has been to you a most powerful supporter, & had I not the conviction that the closer you

at the same time that the measures would not be worse, he would at least have the advantage of being served by a Minister who would be disposed to conciliate him by every concession on his buildings &c.

connect yourself with him the safer will you be.

\* In all that I have related to you in respect to the King's feelings about Canning, there may seem much of contradiction and much of paradox.

You may say that the King cannot detest him & yet be ready under certain circumstances to make him Prime Minister. Ask the Duke, & he will confirm all that I have told you. [You could hear from the Duke that the King<sup>1</sup>] hates what he calls the *sarcastic* ways of Canning; that he abuses him for what he calls his  $\wedge$  sophistry & for his false policy in foreign affairs; & that he despises him for what he thinks political cowardice, & for what he considers a contemptible seeking after popularity. But ask the Duke again, & he will tell you that, failing in other quarters, the King wd. fly to Canning & put all power into his hands, shd. it continue to appear to him that you do not assert as Prime Minister what he conceives to be yr. just power & influence. In one word, he will have you as his real Minister if he can, [& with pleasure he will keep you as such,<sup>2</sup>] but he is wild with the idea, & you may call it insanity if you please, that Canning never leaves you for a moment at rest, & that by assiduity, by perseverance, by insinuation, & by every tool & weapon he can use, he continues to pervert yr. better judgement & to turn you in all things to his own purposes.

Thus much with regard to the King.

[I can finish in a very few words all that I have to say<sup>2</sup>] with regard to

$\wedge$  metaphysical

<sup>1</sup> For this, Wellington substituted, 'He said to us both, as you would hear from the duke as well as from me that he . . .'

<sup>2</sup> Deleted by Wellington.

Knighton. He is a man with a most astute and acute intellect. He is however [a low man & <sup>1</sup>] a very vain man. You have galled him to the very soul by not allowing him to emerge from the lowness of his former situation.

No one was ever more insane than he is on this one point. [He will either break himself down, or he will break you down if you do not consent to his being a Privy Councillor.<sup>1</sup>] I believe he dreams of it. I am sure at least that he talks of nothing else ; & in this state of mind, considering who and what he is, are you to expect that he will not seek occasions & make occasions of doing you all the evil that he can, & of instilling poison into the King's mind ?

\* He has been led to believe by Ld. Francis Conyngham that certainly Canning did oppose it at first ; but that now he has taken a different, & to him a more favourable, view of the subject. You & Peel are made to bear the whole weight ; & I must say that in this you are not quite fairly treated, for tho' Peel did oppose the most of all, you, I am sure, for I knew it from yourself, were quite prepared to do that which appeared to the others best.

\* I now come to the conclusion ; & to that which is the most important part of the whole. How is all this to be remedied ? How is the King to be brought to feel that Canning does not exercise over you more than his due influence ? This I cannot undertake to point out, nor do I know what advice to give. I would only say that I know those of your colleagues who are devotedly attached

He must have learnt, through Lord F. C[onyngham] that there were others besides the Duke present at the discussion of this subject, as the Duke left him thinking that you & he alone discussed it This appears by the Duke's letter.<sup>2</sup>

The first remedy for this state of things would be to gain over Sir W. K. The next, for you to assert the influence & power of your own station as against Mr C. You will be the best judge of what you ought to do to satisfy your colleagues & the K. upon this subject. The satisfaction of the former would probably very soon have for its consequences that of the latter.

<sup>1</sup> Deleted by Wellington.

<sup>2</sup> Wellington apparently scored out his own marginal note.

to you, & who, I am grieved to say, do share this feeling of the King. It may not be difficult for you to prove to yr. colleagues that while you listen to Canning with the deference wch. his talents merit, you are resolved to guide yourself by your own & not by his judgement. Let them see that this is the case; & soon will it be seen to be the case by the King also. It is not that yr. colleagues let the King know what is passing in their minds; but we all know full well that when ideas exist they get abroad.

\* I shd. be acting unkindly & most unfairly by you if I attempted to conceal that in those who are the most attached to you, there is great uneasiness & great regret from the belief that Canning is the one of the Cabinet in whom you confide the most.

\* With regard to what concerns Knighton I have only this to say.

It must be yr. object & your duty as a statesman to exercise the charge committed to you with such instruments as alone are within your reach. You must take into yr. account that this present King will have a favourite, & that if you make that favourite dissatisfied he will be your enemy. Over & over again, & always when he sees me, he recals to my recollection that the time was when I had only to tell him what you wished the King to do, & that the thing was done. Let him be satisfied, let him have his bauble. Think him an idiot for wishing to have the bauble; but give it to him, & enjoy the ease & comfort which will again flow in upon you. You know that the Duke thought it impolitic not to give it to him. Lord Bathurst the same; & I understand that even the Duke of York has the

It is curious enough that he knows exactly who was present and what passed at your house in the consultation on this subject, notwithstanding that, as it appears by the Duke's report to you of what passed between him & K[nighton], the Duke left him in the belief that nobody was consulted but himself, and I did not give him more information in the conversation I had with him. He received this information from Lord F. Conyngham, who informed him that Mr Canning had at first objected to his being admitted to the Council, but not so strongly as Peel; and that he (Canning) has now taken a different view of the case. Thus you & Peel are considered by Knighton as the persons who have opposed yourselves to the attainment of this object; & accordingly you are there in the principal offices of the Govt. to whose interests he is least favorable.

same feeling. And here, by the bye, let me just mention that this extraordinary man, for extraordinary he is, the King's present favourite, has contrived to conciliate the Duke of York & to lay the foundation for the permanence of his influence. All we must guard against is to prevent its appearing that you have been bullied into acquiescence. This we can manage if only it shd. strike you that policy requires the sacrifice.

I make no apology for writing so long a letter. I have now passed many years in trying to serve you with the best means I had; but never did I give so great a proof that no ordinary considerations should stop when yr. welfare required that I should speak out, & plainly.

I must say that you have not been fairly treated in this transaction, as I believe you were not disinclined to the arrangement yourself if others, & particularly Mr C., had not opposed it.<sup>1</sup>

#### 46. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Walmer Castle, 8 October 1823. Most secret.*—I am very much obliged to you for your letter, which I received this morning. I was in some degree prepared for what you tell me about the Ch[ancellor's] letter, & yet there never was an innocent, kindly intended (perhaps unnecessary) step so entirely misinterpreted. I had no object in showing the K. the Chan.'s letter, but in some degree to prepare the K.'s mind for the discussions (as I told him) we must have before the next session of Parlt., & to prove to him the Ch. could not be as ill as had been represented. There is not one word in that letter which marks any difference of opinion. We *both* see the difficulties which must attend any new system for the judicial business in the House of Lords. From the nature of his mind, he sees those difficulties somewhat stronger than I may do, but we agree about the *alternatives*, & if possible we agree still more as to the individuals who are to be brought forward. In short, independent of the *necessary* difficulties of the case (which would exist whoever were the individuals to be employ'd) the only *HITCH* which I have apprehended would arise from the K. being desirous of bringing forward Leach,<sup>2</sup> to which I should certainly object, but to which the Chancellor would feel far more objections than ever I should. Indeed, if I was to yield this

<sup>1</sup> The duke wrote these paragraphs on a separate sheet. All his corrigenda are in pencil.

<sup>2</sup> Sir John Leach was the king's confidential legal adviser. In 1816 he was appointed chancellor of the duchy of Cornwall, and in 1818 vice-chancellor of England. Eldon hated him.



point I am satisfied the Ch. never would appear again in the House of Lords on judicial business.

You say the K. conceives Canning to have an unbounded influence over my mind and opinions. I know not on what he grounds this. As long as the Govt. is to be conducted on the system of the last twelve years, it cannot be conducted without a thorough good understanding and confidence between the First Minister and the Minister of the House of Commons. When the situations were reversed, Percival felt this as to me; Londonderry & I always felt it, and I am quite sure the Govt. could not stand many months if the persons in my situation & Canning's were to look at each other with jealousy & suspicion, but I am not aware of Canning having *assumed* in a single instance authority or influence in matters which do not belong to him, and the whole (if it has any foundation) must be grounded upon the notion that Canning & I happen to have agreed more nearly than some of our other colleagues, not upon what was to be *done*, but upon our views of the possible result of the successful French invasion of Spain.

How can the K., however, think he can accomplish his object, if I was to resign, or if I [sic] I was to put myself decidedly in the wrong in any difference with the King? There is no reason why any of my colleagues should follow me, but I think the K. will find himself very much mistaken if he supposes that if he dismissed me because it was *his royal will & pleasure*, or if he created an obvious pretence for this purpose, that Canning, Peel, or anyone of my colleagues would remain behind.

I feel much of what you say about Knighton, but I cannot see the matter as lightly as you do. The very circumstances you state afford the strongest proof of the *dreadful publick evil* of such a man in such a new situation. You will recollect that the objection was an objection of *principle*, and of a *principle* which had been recorded. It is quite true that if those whom I assembled at Fife House had *all* agreed that the objection ought to have been *overruled*, I should have differed with them in opinion, but I should have yielded my opinion to theirs, but the case is now different, after the decision has been taken, and the ground of the decision announced. I will confess to you I see no retreat on this question now.

I am arrived at a period of life when it may not unnaturally be my wish to be relieved from all publick cares. What I have seen of others in similar, or nearly similar situations, confirms my impressions in this respect. The K. is mistaken if he supposes that I have any anxious desire to remain in his service. He cannot be too strongly apprized of this truth. If I see I cannot go on with honour & with credit, it will be for me to consider *when* I can most easily retire, but let the K. take care that he does not make the close of a reign which has been hitherto most glorious, & upon the whole most prosperous, stormy & miserable.

I have been led further than I intended, but I have stated fully to you all that I feel upon reading, with the attention it deserves, your very kind & friendly letter.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *Engl. Hist. Review*, Jan. 1940 (*George IV and Sir William Knighton*), pp. 67-9.

47. The Earl of Liverpool to Colonel Stephenson.<sup>1</sup>

*Walmer Castle, 10 October 1823. Copy.*—It is with the deepest concern & regret that I feel I have no alternative but to communicate to you the inclosed letter, which I have this day received from his Majesty. I cannot doubt that the incident to which his Majesty refers has arisen from some mistake, & I therefore most earnestly press upon you the propriety of making, without delay, a dutiful explanation & apology to his Majesty. In order that you might not be taken by surprise, I have requested Mr. Peel to deliver to you this letter, & I have fully explained to him my feelings upon the whole of this subject.

I can only add, that it would be a matter of most deep regret to me if his Majesty should unfortunately persevere in his determination.

## 48. The King to the Earl of Liverpool.

*Windsor Castle, 17 October 1823. Private. Copy.*—The inclosed note has just been laid before the King, by the Deputy Comptroller of his Household, and a more *impudent* production it is *impossible* to conceive, as if any order of the description mentioned, could be given by any one but by the King's own special commands. The King has had so many difficulties with this Colonel Stephenson, of a similar description, that it is impossible to go on, and the King therefore desires that Lord Liverpool will immediately place the Board of Works on a different footing, and that Colonel Stephenson be removed.

The King will admit of no apology upon the present occasion.

## 49. The Earl of Liverpool \* to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Walmer Castle, 18 October 1823. Most private & confidential.*—I inclose a very painful & disagreeable correspondence. The several letters explain the whole subject so fully that it is unnecessary in the letter to you to enter into any detail.

Although I think Colonel Stephenson has been very incautious, I have no doubt that Mash is at the bottom of the whole business, and is determined to occasion his removal. Colonel Stephenson is so valuable a servant to the Government, that we must do all we can to save him.

I have taken the course which I thought most prudent for this purpose, & least likely to offend the King. In the present temper of his Majesty's mind, any hesitation to fulfill his commands would only have irritated him, and have made him more fixed in his determination.

I am going to make a proposal to you which may not be very agreeable,

<sup>1</sup> Surveyor-general of the board of works. Extensive alterations and repairs to Windsor Castle were in progress, and Stephenson had countermanded orders concerning the removal of a pulpit, in ignorance of the fact that the king himself had issued such instructions. See *George IV corresp.*, iii 28, 30, 33-4

but still may be of great use in this business, and answer some good effect in others. I am led to do it more particularly, as, if the King should remain inflexible, which I think by no means improbable, we shall have to fill up Colonel Stephenson's office, & this will be a matter of much delicacy & difficulty.

Could you therefore come up to town, see Peel, Long, & Col Stephenson, and afterwards put yourself in the mail coach & come here for a couple of days? The exercise, change of air & scene would do you good, and we could talk over this & other matters with more advantage than we should gain by a hundred letters.

Bathurst & Canning have fixed the second week in November for Cabinets in town—I shall certainly come up to attend them, & for other business, but my present plan is to leave Lady Liverpool here, and return for a week or ten days at the end of November, before I break up my establishment for the year at this place. . . .

#### 50. The Earl of Liverpool\* to Robert Peel.

*Walmer Castle, 18 October 1823. Most private & confidential. Copy.*—I am afraid I must impose upon you a very painful & disagreeable duty, but as a matter of delicacy to Colonel Stephenson, for whom I have a very sincere regard, I will be much obliged to you if you will see him, and deliver to him yourself the inclosed letter, which I have left open for your perusal.

I shall most deeply regret the loss of Colonel Stephenson's services in the office of which he is at the head, as I conscientiously believe him better qualified for it than any other man in the Kingdom. I should hope however that he may be persuaded to make an explanation & apology, which may induce the King to relent, and I would recommend to you to send to Sir Charles Long, and to avail yourself of his assistance with the King, and with Colonel Stephenson. He is fully sensible of Col. Stephenson's merits & utility.

I must own that I think there has been a great error of judgement on the part of Colonel Stephenson in this affair. He may very likely satisfy both you & me that he is *formally & officially* right, but considering that Windsor is now the actual residence of the King—that it is a *new hobby horse*—that his Majesty's delight is in giving orders as to details himself, & that he is very irritable, when he is in any way counteracted in such measures, it would have been much better to have taken no notice at all of the removal of the pulpit, or at least Col. Stephenson should have informed himself privately, in the first instance, whether it had been removed in consequence of any personal directions from the King.

I send you a copy of the letter which I have written to his Majesty. I know that at this time his temper of mind towards myself is such that it never would have done to have put off executing his commands. I thought it was more prudent, therefore, and far more likely to answer its purpose, to let him know that his commands had been executed, than to make an appeal to his kindness.

I do not wish to put you to the inconvenience of any personal communication with the King upon this subject, but as you are on the spot, much good may be done & evil averted, by your being so kind as to see Col. Stephenson & Sir Charles Long.

### 51. The Earl of Liverpool \* to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Walmer Castle, 21 October 1823. Most private & confidential.*— . . . Before you receive this letter you will have seen Peel, Long, & Stephenson, and be able to judge exactly how the matter stands. The first point is to save Stephenson if possible; he will be a severe loss to us, and I am quite sure with the King's projects as to Windsor Castle he will be a great loss to him, as it will be difficult if not impossible to replace him with any person equally conversant in the business, and in whom the Treasury have equal confidence.

In short, as at the head of the Treasury, I would undertake things with him as the instrument, which I should have great difficulty in undertaking with any person in whom I could not have the same confidence. Long should make use of this with the King, not as coming from me, but as a suggestion naturally occurring to himself. I must, however, say that I think Stephenson decidedly wrong. I believe Long is correct in thinking him wrong *officially*, because whatever belongs to the internal arrangements of the Palaces belongs to the Lord Chamberlain—but he is still more wrong in being captious about little changes in those Palaces where the King *actually* resides.

If even the King had less pleasure than he has in details, it is impossible to apply strict official etiquette to the houses in which a King lives, as you may do to other Palaces. I should hope, therefore, that Stephenson would have no difficulty in making a suitable apology.

The King ought to accept it, as Stephenson has not disobeyed any orders of his—he has only asked a question, and if the proceeding was not otherwise irregular, no office is bound to consider that an order must come by the King's commands unless it is so expressed. I have known a Secretary of State's order resisted, because upon the face of it, it was not stated to be given by the King's commands. The Secretary of State was obliged to send a second order in due form, & then it was obeyed.

I must leave it to your discretion after communicating with those above named, what course you will adopt. I have (as I told the King) no personal nor political interest in the matter, but only a desire to save a meritorious servant, & to avoid a step which, I am sure, will not be either for the King's benefit or convenience.

If, however, the King should not relent, the most important point will be, what is to be done with the office, and upon this, I should wish much to talk with you before I come to any decision. . . .

*Ibid., Walmer Castle. 4 November 1823. Most private & confidential.*— . . . Upon referring to my correspondence with the King last year respecting Huskisson, I find it so very clear and explicit on the subject of his being

admitted into the Cabinet at the expiration of a year, or sooner, if the Cabinet was reduced in numbers, that I cannot anticipate any difficulty on the part of his Majesty, to whom I have written, and quoted the paragraphs in my letters, and his, to this effect.

I think it, however, better that not a word should be said on this subject to any one until I receive his Majesty's answer,<sup>1</sup> which must be in two or three days.

## 52. Mrs. Arbuthnot to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Woodford, Wednesday, [12 November 1823].*—I was very sorry when I heard the carriage drive off, but I hope & trust & *believe* that this journey will have a good termination, & that you will not be disappointed in your hopes with the K[ing] & Sir Wm. [Knighton]. But, however, if that shd. fail, I hope you will not be cast down, but make the best bargain you can with the other. However I *shall hope* for the most agreeable [result] & be more anxious than ever for your letters, for tho' I do not think this place so indispensable to my comfort as it is to yours, still even for myself I shd. be very sorry indeed, & I know it wd. be so terrible to you that I shd. be really in despair. However I do not think of such an alternative, & have been seeing the trees cut this morning. . . . I am very dull without you, my dearest, but still I cannot be sorry you are gone, for you will have the affair off your mind. God bless you, dearest love, I hope you have not been very cold.

[P.S.] I wish so much, dearest, that I had money & the means of setting yr. heart at rest. I shd. be the happiest person in the world, we shd. have nothing to wish for.<sup>2</sup>

*Ibid., c. 12th.*—I have written to Mr Herries, my dearest love, just as you desired. I have also written some remarks upon the man's letter (which is really almost laughable) which you had better ask Mr H. to show you, & I have also sent a statement in Crighton's handwriting, that all the expense of the garden & *in* the plantations are paid by us & the farm has done nothing but keep the hedges & ditches in order, which I imagine is matter of course.

To you however I will say that if Crighton tells truth it is another proof of his extravagance, for he says the ditches round my little plantations cost £50 a year. Now if they do (which I don't believe) conceive what *all the hedges on the farm must cost!* But it is impossible. However this is *par parenthèse*, for it is quite fair that the farm shd. keep those hedges in order. When you see Mr. R., if I was you I wd. say that you cannot be expected to sell yr. estate upon the valuation of a man you know nothing of, who evidently runs down everything, who has made such false statements & who knows nothing of the value of stock; that you are now obliged to consider the subject in a very different way to what you have hitherto, that you *had* considered you

<sup>1</sup> *George IV corresp.*, iii 38 (6 November).

<sup>2</sup> The king borrowed £15,000 to relieve Arbuthnot's financial embarrassments (*George IV corresp.*, iii. 43-9). This letter is addressed to Whitehall Place, London.

were doing business with a friend anxious to oblige you, but that you now find it is in the hands of a person who is a stranger to you, & who is naturally looking only to her own interest; that a land valuer you know nothing of, chosen by Mr Herries, & originally recommended by Mr R. values the estate at £40,000 & that as the times are improved since that, you cannot think yourself justified in selling it for less; that a rent of £1,000 a year is  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent upon the whole, & that you do not believe that land pays more in general; but that the whole subject has assumed such a new form that you must take time to consider, & only endeavour to ascertain his intentions, what he is willing to give for the estate & what rent he is inclined to take. This is what I wd. do in the first interview with R. & I wd. certainly remark upon his having thrown it into his wife's hands while he pretended to be doing you a favour. Then what I wd. try to do with Knighton wd. be to get the King to buy the estate for 40, or £45,000, the latter if possible, with the understanding that you will buy it back when Mrs Lisle dies. But in fact I wd. tell Knighton *exactly* how you are situated, & get him to do the best he could. If you cd. get 45,000 from the King for the estate, you wd. very soon get from Ld. L[iverpool] enough to clear scores with that man! But I wd. tell Knighton exactly how you are circumstanced, & see what he thinks he can do. If the King wd. buy the estate it wd. be delightful, because then, if it ever came out, you wd. not care a pin about it. Do try this if possible. It wd. make me so happy & you wd. be so at ease. Make Mr Herries show you what I have written. I hope you will like it. Pray keep up y[ou]r spirits & do not talk of being broken down, my dearest. I look forward to our passing many happy years together, & if we can but get rid of these money concerns & make the farm pay *tolerably*, our next ten years will be happier than the last. I have set my heart upon the King buying the estate, we buying it back when Mrs Lisle dies. Try this, my dearest.

I hope you were not very cold on the journey, I was afraid you wd. be, for it was very cold here. No letter came from Ld. L[iverpool] unless it was in the large packet I sent back. I am glad you like the rooms.

I shall be *so anxious* to hear what passes with Knighton; urge the King's buying the estate *for the time*, it wd. be a great favour, but you are an old & attached servant of his & have claims on him. I really hope he will, if Knighton will recommend it.

God bless you, my dearest love, I am very happy that my love & affection support you, but I hope soon that you will only have to consider it as adding to the happiness which all yr. other concerns bestow upon you.

Tell me when you answer this, whether I shall write about going to Warwick.

I enclose the letter to Mr H[erries] because while you are away it is as well not to be sending him large packets, particularly as I spoke to Crighton about it.

I forgot to tell you that about ten minutes after you got up yesterday, the Duke came & *thundered* at the door in a way that wd. have awoken the dead. He did not wait for an answer, concluding probably that no sleep could resist *such knocking*!

[*Ibid.*, Woodford, P.M. 29 November 1823].—Your letter this morning was really beyond anything delightful I can know, such a succession of fortunate events really hardly ever occurs, and almost frightens me. Believe me I rejoice ten times more in the ease & comfort all this will procure to you, than for any advantages to myself. You were always so kind to me & took such care that I at least shd. feel no want of money that I have never wished for a comfort more than I have always had. But I do feel delight in the idea that you will in future be exempt from the care & anxiety that has worn you so much. The enclosed letter, as you see, is not franked & has no post mark upon it, & it surprised me so much I opened it before yours & was a good deal *fussed* at the contents till I had read yours. As the King gives you the money I do not know why he sent for the Duke; however he is such a kind & dear friend to us that I am sure we shd. have told him what the King had done. I am rather afraid he will be displeased at our not having told him, & especially with me as he will think that I need have had no scruple, whatever you had. I have written him a long letter, but I have said *nothing* of your affairs, I have told him you wd. already have talked with him & that therefore it was unnecessary. I have told him my great reason for silence was that I knew he wd. insist upon helping us, which you wd. not have liked, nor I, as it wd. have altered our position with him. The reason I did not enter into yr. affairs was that I did not know how much the King knew or what you wd. tell him. Dearest love, we shall indeed be rich & happy, but let us be *stingy* in future & take care that such distresses shall never come upon us again. I long for yr. letter tomorrow; you will have seen Knighton, perhaps the Duke, & will tell me everything. How very kind of Lord Bathurst, pray tell me what the place is worth; you have never mentioned [it] but I think I have heard you say it is £1000 a year! Upon my word we shall have *too much* money, but I do not comprehend why the Duke was to be sent for. I do hope the King will not tell Ly. Conyngham. I have been calculating we shall have £4000 a year to spend, besides the insurance for me, & no debt; you must only make this place *pay the rent*. It is really *very kind* of the King, his first impulses always are kind, but afterwards comes in his selfishness, & by & bye I have no doubt he will say G—— d—— him, he has ruined me by making me give him £15,000. However that won't signify to us if he only makes the remark to his banker. I don't understand why the banker is so anxious to serve you, for he is an interested man, & after all you have never done anything for him. I long to hear what you thought of their sending to the Duke, what he said, what you said to him, in short, all about it. Return me his letter. God bless you, my dearest love, I trust we shall live together many happy years, & never again have any annoyances & distresses, you know I have always said money was our bane, & now we are quite relieved upon that point, I hope no new evil will arise. But I am not afraid. I must just add that tho' nobody ever had so many & kind friends, nobody ever deserved them so well, for you would always do anything to be kind & good natured, & these feelings I am certain never go unrewarded.

## 53. The Duke of Wellington to George Canning.

*Stratfield Saye, 5 December 1823. Copy.*—I received some days ago a letter from General Alava<sup>1</sup> explaining the situation to which he was reduced in consequence of the decrees of the Regency, sanctioned by the King of Spain, and urging me to endeavour to obtain something for him from the Govt. I don't know whether the Govt. have it in their power to do anything for any of these Spanish emigrants, although many of them, and some not the most deserving, were provided for in England between the years 1814 & 1820. But if Govt. can do anything for any of them, I am certain that there are none with such claims as General Alava. He is the most moderate of all the proscribed. He assisted us in our negotiation as far as he dared, & he has been uniformly since the year 1808 the friend of the English name & nation in Spain. But his services with the army in which he was desperately wounded, certainly give him claims to the consideration of the British Govt. which no other Spaniard can have. I therefore venture to recommend him to you, if it should be possible to do anything for any Spaniard whatever.

## 54. George Canning to the Duke of Wellington.

*Gloucester Lodge, 8 December 1823, 6 p.m. Private.*—Your letter of *Friday*, dated at Stratfieldsaye, has, by some accident, not come to my hands till this moment, which is the more unaccountable as that of this morning (inclosing the copy of your letter to the K. of the Netherlands) reached me several hours ago.

I was on the point of speaking to you on Friday when you called on me in Downing Street, upon this very subject of Spanish emigrants, but the other things that we had to talk about put it out of my head. My own notion is that we should do something for these poor people, upon a pretty general, & (so far as that is possible) upon a pretty liberal scale. In that case, there must, I think, be no distinction of party. I do not mean that the cases of individuals, & specifically Genl. Alava's, should not be distinguished, but the distinction should be rather in *amount* of aid, than by giving to one, and withholding altogether from another.

If you are staying in town I should be very glad indeed of an opportunity of talking with you upon this matter. I have appointments tomorrow with C[oun]t Villa Real at 12, & with poor Jabat (whose wretchedness has been aggravated by a paralytick attack) at one. After that hour I could either call at Apsley House, or expect you here, as you liked best.

I have had a letter today from *Mina*; a most becoming & gentlemanlike letter, which I will show or send to you tomorrow.

## 55. The Duke of Wellington to George Canning.

*Woodford, 9 December 1823.*—It is most probable that I put my letter of the 5th into the Ordnance portfolio, and that it was sent to Lord J. H. Somerset

<sup>1</sup> The Spanish general and statesman (1770–1843) He was compelled to retire to Gibraltar and subsequently to England after the French army had restored Ferdinand VII.



in the country, which was the cause of the delay I am afraid you will find it very difficult to go far in favour [sic] of Spanish emigrants. I mean farther than the principal people, & that by the means already at the disposal of the Govt. rather than by any fresh grant from Parlt. The Opposition have set up a subscription and I was asked to become a subscriber, & indeed a director. I gave no answer for these reasons: first, the object is not charity but faction. Secondly, the objects are to be not Spaniards, the victims of the oppressive acts of the restored Govt.—but *strangers* resorting to England in consequence of the recent events in Spain That is to say, all the military & revolutionary adventurers of Europe, who, having failed in overturning the Govts. of their own countries, flocked to Spain, and gave to Spain the colour of a revolutionary Power, and are in fact the primary cause of what has happened in that country. Whatever you do on this subject, keep clear of the Opposition.

#### 56. George Canning to the Duke of Wellington.

*Gloucester Lodge, 10 December 1823. Private.*—You entirely misconceive me if you think that I have any notion of co-operating with the Opposition, or indeed with anyone else. My notion is that the victims of Ferdinand's absurd & monstrous proscriptions, who make this country their asylum, being of course *Spaniards*, might be the objects of the bounty of Govt. much in the same way as the French emigrants were (*before we were at war with France*) & other refugees, who have fled from tyranny in other times, & from other countries. I am quite sure that you cannot restrict your bounty, if you give anything, to one or two—on what plea soever, for if the two or one should be victims of Ferdinand, no line of distinction that could be drawn between them & others would be satisfactory. My belief is that unless something of this sort (on however moderate a scale) is done by Govt. before Parlt. meets, it will be done afterwards, not on *motion* perhaps, but on suggestion. . . .

#### 57. The Duke of Wellington to George Canning.

*Woodford, 11 December 1823. Draft.*—It appears to me that there is a material distinction between the case of the Spanish emigrants of this day and that of the French emigrants at the period of the French Revolution. The latter were reputed at least to be the victims of loyalty to their sovereign, and with whatever feelings I might be disposed to consider the case of the Spanish emigrants, I never can consider a case founded upon a military mutiny & rebellion, as one to be compared with one founded on loyalty to the sovereign. I believe that no general provision was made for French emigrants in this country before we went to war or were upon the very eve of war with the French Govt. But the case of the French emigrants is not the only precedent. There is a precedent of the year 1814 of Spanish emigrants; and though I don't know what passed in the Cabinet on that occasion, I know that the provision did not extend to all, as I endeavoured to obtain it for some, &

among others, for no less a person than Monsr. de Torreno,<sup>1</sup> & did not succeed in obtaining it in any instance. I got £500 in one payment for Monsr. de Torreno, and I believe that even Mina had nothing. Now I maintain that whatever may be the conduct of Ferdinand towards the Spanish emigrants at present, it was equally oppressive in 1814; and whatever the merits of those of the present day, in the view of any, I must claim for those of 1814 some merit in the eyes of the British Govt. But there is another view of this subject which renders it necessary to make it a case of selection rather than a general one. If you will give to everybody, you will have armies of emigrants, if not privates, at least officers. Is that proper in any view of this case? Is it consistent with our station of neutrality in the war? I would make the provision one of selection as it was in 1814, to be limited in the whole by the means of the command of the Govt., and in respect to each individual by his reasonable wants. I would found the provision upon the claims which each individual might have upon this Govt. by his conduct towards our Ministers whether during the war or since 1820, or upon his talents or distinction of any kind; as I conceive that it would be unworthy of this nation to allow persons of that character of whose conduct the Govt. did not disapprove, to starve in this country. But without calling this provision by the invidious name (towards the receivers) of charity, it should be that & nothing else; & above all it should convey no approbation of or participation in the principles which have occasioned the events which have brought these emigrants to our shores. What I meant by reference to the Opposition was to shew you the difference between their views as appeared by their paper, and any practical view of the case, and I entreat you not to take their view.<sup>2</sup>

#### 58. Earl Bathurst to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Downing Street, 22 December 1823. Private & confidential.*—I had intended to have defer'd doing anything more respecting the Agency until I saw you, but I think there may be a convenience in writing fully to you now.

You will, I think, agree with me, after having seen the papers relating to the increase of the salary to twelve hundred, that it would be difficult after what has passed, to maintain it at that rate now, but I do not think that there would be much difficulty in defending your appointment at the reduc'd salary; & I conceive that on this footing Canning might be brought to think more favourably of it.

With respect to his proposal of appointing your son, I will tell you fairly what are the objections which I feel to it. By the bye, I find (what does not make me think more favourably of it) that it was a suggestion of Huskisson to Canning.

By appointing you, I upheld the efficiency of the situation; by the appointment of your son, it becomes a matter of grace & favour, & the efficiency of the situation is given up—and it is the efficiency of these situations which are called in question. If this were a solitary instance, it might stand the

<sup>1</sup> See *W.S.D.*, xi. 569.

<sup>2</sup> See *W.N.D.*, ii. 349, 425.

attack; but unfortunately the two last have been of the same description—Seymour was appointed to Malta with the salary of six hundred: & Lt. Col. Master to Berbice with one of two hundred. He is the nephew of a neighbour of mine in the County, was Lord Talbot's Aid-de-camp, & lived in his house; & being a married man, the sudden loss of his situation<sup>1</sup> made this appointment, small as it is, of convenience to him. Now if it should appear, & these things on discussion some how or other are sure to appear, that these Agencies are given to three young officers in the army, would it not at once endanger the whole establishment? I am confident that your appointment would stand upon much better grounds: but if you shall be unwilling to accept it, after having consulted with Liverpool & others, I am ready to put the Agency in your hands to make an exchange of it for some other place for your son: of course you would, I am sure, have a reputable person to recommend. In doing this, I place a greater reliance on you than I would in most men; & it is that you may have time to turn all this in your mind, that I now write to you.

Shew this letter to the Duke of Wellington & consult him on the subject.

#### 59. Sir William Knighton to the Duke of Wellington.

*Pavilion, 29 January 1824. Confidential. Private.*— . . . I am commanded by his Majesty to send your Grace his most affectionate regards; & to say, that upon the whole H.M. approves the Despatch to Sir Wm. A Court on South American affairs, always relying with security on your scrupulous & watchful attention.<sup>2</sup>

#### 60. Earl Bathurst to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Cirencester, 15 August 1824. Private & confidential.*— . . . The Duke is quite right in thinking that the person about the King should be one in his own service: but I do not quite understand whether Lord Francis is to supersede Sr. William Knighton, or to be an Under-Secretary of State resident at Windsor. I imagine the latter, & that it is in part to justify the appointment of Lord Howard as third Under-Secretary of State, with a salary of one thousand a year deducted from Lord Francis's salary, of which Lord Francis, I hear, (not knowing of the proposed arrangement, I imagine,) has of late complained.<sup>3</sup>

There could not be a safer person appointed if such an appointment were to take place. He is too mild & too much in awe of the King to be anything

<sup>1</sup> On Lord Talbot's recall from Ireland in 1821, when Wellesley was appointed lord-lieutenant.

<sup>2</sup> The despatch, dated the 30th, is in *Parl. Deb.*, x N.S. 715. It expressed the government's view 'that the recognition of such of the new States as have established *de facto* their separate political existence, cannot be much longer delayed'.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Francis Conyngham had become one of the under-secretaries of state for foreign affairs in January 1823, and in July 1824 Lord Howard de Walden, the son of Canning's friend, Charles Ellis, was appointed an under-secretary.

but devoted to him ; & more mischief would be done by irritating the lady,<sup>1</sup> which an opposition to the appointment would create, than can happen by any influence which Lord Francis would ever exert.

Who is to succeed Planta ? His going to the Treasury is undoubtedly a most important step in Canning's favour ; & will be made more so by Lord Liverpool, who dislikes Planta, & will therefore throw him into Canning's arms, as Planta will see that he has not his proper master's confidence—whereas, as I believe Planta to be an honest man, Lord Liverpool could make him what he ought to be, by more conciliatory conduct. . . .<sup>2</sup>

#### 61. Charles Arbuthnot to his wife.

*Dutton, 1 November 1824.*— . . . It is a delight to me to hear from you ; & I am glad the Duke is with you as he always makes a home pleasant. Pray tell him that I do not write to him today as I shd. be late ; but that I will write a line tomorrow, & I daresay I shall have had an answer from Ld. Liverpool. Nothing can be more clear than the memm. upon the Indian papers wch. the Duke sent to me ; & I will return it to him when I write tomorrow. That Lord F[rancis] C[onyngnam] is a detestable fellow. Knighton had told me that he was become the *devoted* of Canning, & he proves it. I am glad that the King has seen the papers. . . .

I cannot say how pleased I am that the Duke entered into *that* correspondence with Canning.<sup>3</sup> It will show C. that he will not be allowed to play any pranks. I am glad *you* told me the King highly approved of the Duke's letters ; for the Duke in writing to me suppresses that part, & only says that he showed them. . . .

#### 62. Sir William Knighton to the Duke of Wellington.

*Saturday, 27 November 1824. Confidential.*—I am commanded by H.M. to acquaint your Grace, that I have been ordered to the Continent again, & that I am to set out tonight. H.M. wishes to have it as little known as may be practicable. The impression is that the death of Ld. Mt. Charles is near at hand, & therefore I am sent !<sup>4</sup> Under all the circumstances of my *agreeable* situation, I of course can only look to the word, obey. I fear however that it may happen that my absence may prove inconvenient.

<sup>1</sup> Lady Conyngham, Lord Francis's mother, and the king's mistress

<sup>2</sup> Planta did not become joint secretary of the treasury until April 1827, succeeding S. R. Lushington, who was appointed governor of Madras. Planta became as devoted to Canning as he had formerly been to Castlereagh.

<sup>3</sup> Respecting Canning's proposed visit to his friend Lord Granville, the British ambassador at Paris. The duke thought it would result in 'inconvenience to the public and annoyance to yourself'. The whole of this angry correspondence is in *W.N.D.*, ii. 313-26.

<sup>4</sup> Lord Mountcharles, the eldest son of the Marquess Conyngham, died at Nice in December.

Perhaps your Grace would *confidentially* mention to Mr. Arbuthnot my absence. I suppose it will take me five weeks—for at this season one is obliged to take a circuitous route.

### 63. Charles Arbuthnot to the Earl of Liverpool.

*Woodford, 29 December 1824. Private & confidential.*—The Duke of Wellington came here yesterday in his way to Apethorpe, where we shall all be tomorrow. He has very recently been at Windsor, & while there he heard so much from the King, & observed also so much of the workings of his mind, that he was half inclined to write to you himself. As, however, you & he have in some respects taken different views of the subjects lately under discussion, he has felt delicacy in reverting again to those differences, & I, therefore, being unwilling that you shd. remain in ignorance of what is passing, have resolved to communicate to you the substance of what I have heard.

The King has, I believe, a much more fixed & settled unwillingness to have any political connexion with the revolted Spanish Colonies than you may be aware of. He has consented to what his Ministers have advised because he did not know how he could take another course; but the determination to prosecute O'Connell (of which in itself he would highly approve) has given fresh excitement to his mind, & has made him loud in his declaration that we can have no right to enter upon such a prosecution while we ourselves are by our negotiations intending to sanction the deeds of Bolivar, the holding up of which as an example to Ireland is the crime of which O'Connell is to be accused.<sup>1</sup> When the Duke was at Windsor, the King in talking to him expatiated much upon this argument; & he is so intent & earnest upon his purpose that he either has written or intends to write to Peel about it.

You are aware that whatever may be the Duke's opinion in the Cabinet, he never fails to give to his colleagues all the support he can in his communications with the King. Such also has been his conduct upon the present occasion. He endeavoured to make the King feel that great was the difference between the seditious language of O'Connell, & the conduct with respect to S. America which this Government was meaning to pursue, O'Connell, in citing Bolivar, was endeavouring to rouse the Irish to rebellion; but this Government, on the contrary, had no other object in view than to look at S. America as that country at present stood, & to act with regard to it in the manner that the interests of our own country might require. I understand from the Duke that such was the tenour of his language to the King. Nothing however that he cd. say appeared to have the smallest effect upon the King's mind; and indeed there are other circumstances which have caused the King to revert to the subject of S. America with more warmth, & indeed irritation, than your own discussions with him may have led you to expect.

<sup>1</sup> At a meeting of the Catholic Association O'Connell was alleged to have expressed a hope that a Bolivar would arise to avenge the wrongs of the Irish people. The prosecution broke down.

Some of his Ministers in explaining their own conduct to the King dwelt much upon the offensive manner in which the French Government replied to our questions respecting the occupation of Spain by French troops. More than one of yr. colleagues assured the King that they shd. not have advised him to take measures which must lead to the recognition of the S. American States if they had not been led to consider the occupation of Spain as either permanent or at least as depending upon mere French will & pleasure.<sup>1</sup> In the speech of the King of France quite a different version is given to this question; for the occupation is declared to be temporary, & the language respecting it is such as ought, in the King's opinion, to be quite satisfactory to this Government. The King, therefore, as he told the Duke of Wellington, is strongly impressed with the idea that both he & some of his Ministers have consented to measures which they would have rejected if the real meaning & intentions of the French Government had been more accurately known. Be this as it may, it is right, I think, that you should be aware of what is passing in the King's mind.

It is also important for you to know that the King is not the only one of his family whose mind, with respect to the conduct of the Government, is not in a satisfactory state. In speaking to the Duke of Wellington much was said by the King of the opinions of the Duke of York; & it was quite evident that he thinks as the King does, & that he has told the King very fully all that he does think. Indeed this surprises me the less, as, when I met the Duke of York very recently at Sudbourne, he expressed great uneasiness at what he understood to be now passing in the Cabinet. To say the truth it was principally against Canning, & the influence of Canning, that the Duke of York principally directed his observations; but upon this part of the subject in particular, I wish to be considered as writing in the strictest confidence. I would conceal nothing from you, but as the Duke of York chose to be very confidential with me, I should be very anxious to quote him to no one but to you alone.

The Duke of Wellington thought it right to apprise Peel of the King's intention to write to him<sup>2</sup>—with the Duke's own opinions you are well acquainted; & tho' you will always be sure to receive from him all the honourable support that he can give you with the King, yet I see plainly that the judgement which he had originally formed upon S. American subjects, is, with the progress of events, become more fixed than ever. He tells me that in Cabinet he had always quoted the instance of Ireland; & therefore it is no surprise to him that the King has now taken up the same notion.

There is one more point upon which I wish to say a word. We must not imagine that the Opposition, if the King shd. in extremity resort to them, would in all things run counter to his pleasure. They have in former times given their pledges; & these when in power they have made subservient to their own convenience & new notions. It was but the other day that Lord

<sup>1</sup> It lasted until 1827.

<sup>2</sup> 'In order that Peel, if he thought proper, [might] communicate with you previous to giving his answer.' (Wellington's marginal addition, in pencil)

Holland said to the Duke of Wellington that the French could not quit Spain ; that in that country there must be either French Army or Cortez. The Opposition have always known well how to shape their measures to their interest ; & in the outset at least, were they to be taken by the King, they wd. be very accommodating to retain their power.

I have stated to you as accurately as I have been able all that I have heard from the Duke. His wish has been to conceal nothing from you ; but as I have said before, he has felt unwillingness to touch again upon former differences. I wish more than I dare hope that between the King & his Government some most serious differences may not arise.<sup>1</sup>

#### 64. Mrs. Arbuthnot to Charles Arbuthnot.

[? 1824].—I shd. have refused the Duke at once from feeling how desirable a little tranquillity at home was for us both, & yr. kindness in giving up yr. own wishes to oblige me wd. only make me ten times more desirous of giving up any scheme that interfered with you ; but I have thought it an excellent opportunity for writing the enclosed to the Duchess.<sup>2</sup> After all it is very desirable for us to be well with her, tho' she is odious, and if you approve what I have written, pray send it on to her. It wd. make it still better if you wd. add a line saying you join with me in anxiety to set ourselves right with her. . . . We are not the least more bound to go, but an explanation & a restoration of good humour wd. be very pleasant. . . . My dearest, I hope you will be satisfied with Ld. L[iverpool]. The Duke is quite of opinion that you shd. *not* take the reduced salary ;<sup>3</sup> indeed he thinks, as it interferes with yr. pension, that the large salary is not of the same consequence to you. I cd. not say much to him, as he is deaf, & unless I ride home with him after shooting, I don't see him alone. He seems quite well, looks better, and eats voraciously. I think I have prevented his eating anything but roast meat at dinner, & this morning at breakfast he eat 2 eggs, 3 rolls, & a quantity of cold meat. I think he cannot be very ill. . . . God bless you, my dearest love, I hope at the end of another ten years you will love me as much as now, & if I am alive I am certain I shall love you more. . . . My dearest,

<sup>1</sup> Wellington wrote, in pencil, on this draft — 'I told the King that his Govt. had no intention of giving any opinion upon the former conduct of Bolivar, on the origin of his power, or on the insurrection of the colonies ; but to take the case as it stood, and to act upon it for the benefit of the King's subjects. This I told him the first time he mentioned the idea to me. The second time, I told him that his servants would, in answer to his objections on the score of O'Connell, make the representation, as above, & contend that there was no inconsistency in prosecuting O'Connell, & at the same time making the treaty with the state of Colombia. The King contended that there was ; that the prosecution must be carried on in earnest, and that it was impossible for him to take two half measures, one for the prosecution, the other of recognition of this State.' For the struggle between king and cabinet over the question of recognising the independence of the Spanish-American colonies, see Temperley's *Foreign policy of Canning*, pp. 145-7.

<sup>2</sup> The duchess of Wellington (d. 1831). She and the duke were never formally separated, but they lived a good deal apart.

<sup>3</sup> Attached to the office of colonial agent for Ceylon. See Nos. 52, 58.

I sometimes think that yr. anxiety to be kind to me arises from thinking that I may fancy you used to be cross. Now indeed I never did, I have always thought you a thousand times too good for me, & I only hope I make you happy, as happy as you make me. C'est tout dire.

*Ibid.*, [Watermark, 1824].— . . . I shall be rather glad if you have not asked Mr. Croker for I got a letter from the Duke yesterday with a long tirade about his vulgarity & impertinence, talking of *Mrs Croker's brother as one of the aristocracy*. . . .<sup>1</sup>

#### 65. Sir Walter Scott to the Duke of Wellington.

*Abbotsford*, 5 January 1825.—The manuscripts<sup>2</sup> reached my hands today in perfect safety. They seem very important and are in high preservation, easily read, and I dare say highly interesting. I find my Spanish much rusted, but I have the efficient assistance of my son-in-law John Lockhart, who is a capital linguist. The Spanish nobles, I observe, who usually write the subscription to their individual opinions, write a most wretched scrawl. The history of Peru seems extremely curious, and if it has never been printed, is, I should think, very deserving to see the light. Your Grace may depend on my taking much care of the MSS which their own value and the high respect due to the quarter from which they come so eminently deserve. I am here for a few days longer, and on my return to Edinburgh I will consult with Lord Robertson on the subject of the MSS, and take the liberty to transmit to your Grace our opinion on what may seem the best mode of bringing them before the public. . . .

#### 66. Mrs. Arbuthnot to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Brighton*, Thursday [? 3 February 1825].— . . . By the bye I have seen here Miss Harriet Wilson's book.<sup>3</sup> It is great nonsense, but very little indecency, indeed none. What she says of the Duke is so ridiculous & so unlike him that I shd. doubt her knowing him except for his generosity in giving her money whenever she wanted it, & I shd. not think he wd. care about it except for the bore of having his intrigues shewn up. Alava told me yesterday he was sure I must always have had la conduite la plus parfaite, & have established the best reputation that anybody ever had, for that in this most médisante country in the world, tho' everybody saw how intimate I was with the Duke, & how much he admired & liked me, & tho' he had the reputation of always being faisant *les grimaces aux femmes*, no creature ever even imagined the possibility of an impropriety in it. I hope this will please you, dearest. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Croker was the daughter of William Pennell, afterwards a consul in South America.

<sup>2</sup> For a note on these manuscripts, see *Scott letters* (ed. Sir Herbert Grierson), viii 452-3.

<sup>3</sup> Her *Memoirs*.



## 67. Charles Arbuthnot to the Duke of Wellington.

*Woodford, Monday, 25 April 1825. Private.*—Mrs Arbuthnot writes to me that you are dissatisfied with what passed on the Corn question. This induces me to say a few words more; for as you told me that the discussion had been more temperate, I feared that you had acquiesced. My strong conviction is that Huskisson is one of the most dangerous men that ever was admitted into our councils. His hasty & sudden innovations in trade are sending all the gold out of the country; for in consequence of the reductions of duties, we are making everywhere extensive purchases, while not being met with equal liberality in any part of the Continent, our goods are not admitted in foreign ports on better terms than they were. The consequence is that trade is turning against us, & we are obliged to pay in gold. With all his liberalism in the H. of Cs., Baring<sup>1</sup> is aware of this effect, & he is predicting gt. distress from diminished & diminishing circulation. You know that when gold is required from the Bank, the notes wch. are given for it are cancelled. I heard this from Mr Attwood, a gt. merchant, the day before I left town. Do pray advert to this in Cabinet without however giving yr. authority; but I think you may allude to Baring. If in addition Huskisson is allowed to spread panic all over the land we shall have a *revolution*—not Ld. Wellesley's but a real one.<sup>2</sup> Surely we need not commit ourselves for next year; & as little needful is it to determine upon letting into the market the bonded corn. Could we not take power to do it provided our own corn should rise above 64s pr. qr.? In short I hope & trust that you will prevent mischief. . . .<sup>3</sup>

*Ibid., Drayton House. 12 May 1825.*—I like your paper exceedingly, & I send it back with many thanks by return of post.

As Mrs Arbuthnot says that I must in every paper make verbal alterations, perhaps I may, upon reading it over again, make a trifling change or two with my pencil. But there are two points to which I wish to draw your attention, for it appears to me that upon reflection you may be disposed to make some variation in yr. mode of treating the question.

First of all, I want to save you from the *white lie*.

You know that we *forced* Lord Liverpool to be quite silent towards the King until the subject had been entirely disposed of in the H. of Lords. We told him truly that if a word shd. be said to the King, the whole might transpire, the consequence of which wd. be that we shd. lose our hold upon some of our already wavering supporters among the Peers. But if you deliver yr. paper as it now stands, the appearance will be that you had intended to give that previous notice to the King which for the above reason we had objected to when proposed by Lord Liverpool. We may feel sure that others besides

<sup>1</sup> Whig M.P. for Taunton.

<sup>2</sup> Wellesley was an alarmist, and greatly exaggerated the significance of some disturbances in Dublin in 1822 whilst he was lord-lieutenant

<sup>3</sup> To prevent an excessive rise in the price of corn, which would flood the market with foreign supplies after the price had risen to 80s, and so ruin the farmers, the Bonded Corn Act was passed in 1825, which permitted all the foreign corn then in bond to be released on payment of 10s duty when the home price reached 70s.

the King will read your paper, & it might become necessary to explain to Lord Liverpool that in point of fact your real meaning had been not to communicate with the King while the question was still in suspense.

I should therefore wish that you wd. so far alter the opening part of your paper as to let it be seen that you had waited for the decision in the Lords before you delivered it.

My second point is this. In communicating with the King you have to deal with the most indiscreet man alive. It is on this account, I think, that you enter too much into particulars in respect to the disagreeableness of Peel's situation. In talking confidentially with you, Peel does advert to the communications between his colleagues & Sir F. Burdett &c.; but I should not think that he was prepared to make this a charge against the other H. of C.s Ministers, & should that part of your paper be allowed to remain as it now is, we shd. be sure to have the Duke of York, if not the King, exclaiming everywhere that Peel had been shamefully & treacherously treated by his colleagues.<sup>1</sup>

I therefore shd. be disposed to state the fact that Peel stands alone in the Cabinet among his House of Commons' colleagues; that his position had been felt by him to be too irksome to be borne longer; & that there are also in such an isolated position other circumstances to be considered to which you need not advert, but which you are confident will not escape his My.'s penetration.

I confess that these two alterations wd. be improvements, as I cannot think that they will at all weaken your statement; & they will guard you in the one instance from the possibility of having seemed yourself to take the line from wch. we barred Lord Liverpool, & in the other from the chance of committing Peel with his present colleagues. I think that Mrs. Arbuthnot wd. consider this reasoning as being over cautious; but in my public life I have often had a difficult game between contending parties, & this may have made me very guarded whenever I had had to explain the sentiments of others.

At all events whether in these criticisms I am right or wrong, you will, I am certain, have wished me to give my opinion very freely. A very few strokes of the pen will make the changes which I suggest, supposing that you adopt my notions; & indeed as I think your paper admirable in all other respects, I should have been unwilling to have written what I have, if it had been also necessary to have given another term to the general tenour of your communication.

I cannot but hope that Lord Liverpool, if properly pressed & worked upon

<sup>1</sup> Burdett's Catholic Relief Bill was read a second time in the commons on 21 April by 268 to 241; a third time on 10 May by 248 to 227. A week later, the lords, encouraged by the duke of York's hostile speech on 25 April, threw out the bill by 178 to 130. Peel, the only 'Protestant' cabinet minister in the Commons, finding himself in a minority on the Catholic question, tendered his resignation, but was persuaded to remain in office until a new parliament had pronounced an opinion. His retirement would have been followed by Liverpool's. The rejection of the Relief Bill by the Lords caused Canning to consider whether he should resign, but he decided to remain.

by the King, will see the propriety of remaining. All that has been passing in the H. of C[ommon]s, to say nothing of the decrease in the majority upon the 3d reading, ought to have great weight with him; & the more I consider the subject the more am I convinced that he ought not to abandon us. My real fear is that by his resignation he will lay the ground for bringing the Whigs into power. Could you have Peel, you wd. be independent of Canning; but Peel will go, & Canning will consequently feel that we are left at his mercy. If the King shd. call upon you to form a Government, you must have instruments to work with. Canning might, & not improbably would, say that he would not be the instrument.

Without a leader in the H. of Commons a Government could not be formed; & on our side of the House the only individuals who could lead are Peel & Canning.

For these reasons as well as for others you must strain every nerve to keep Ld. Liverpool; & tho' he may not see the advantage of gaining him, I am sure that this would be of essential use to us, to the King, & to the country. I do not know that I shall have time to write to Lord L. today; but I shall certainly tell him my mind tomorrow. It is not that a letter from me could be expected to move him; but words incessantly poured into his ears by each of us may at last have the desired effect. . .

#### 68. Charles Arbuthnot to the Earl of Liverpool.

*Drayton House, 13 May 1825. Private & confidential. Draft.*—I do not write from entertaining any hope that what I could say would turn you from the determination which you have already taken. In every case you wd. be better able than I am to form a right judgement, & certainly you are in yr. own case far more competent to act for yrself than I could be to act for you; but I wish to know on what day you wd. like me to return, & therefore I am unwilling to delay writing to you any longer. I will attend you at a moment's warning; but I shall attend with heaviness of heart, for after looking at the subject in every way, & on every side, I am more & still more convinced that the step you are about to take is sure to create confusion & mischief without end.

There are two things for which you ought to be prepared. While you are looking to consistency on the one part, you must expect on the other that you will be upbraided for having broken up the Government for a question, the principle of acting upon which had been settled by yourself. Here I beg you to believe that I do not underrate the difficulty in which Peel's resignation would place you; but the public, overlooking such considerations, will have its eye fixed upon the fact that had you remained, the Government would have been safe.

The other point to which I wish to draw your attention is the danger which your resignation will have created of bringing the Whigs into power. The Government will have received a rude shock if you, & Peel, & the Chancellor are lost to it. You think that Canning might succeed if the whole should

be thrown into his heads. But if in addition to you, there should be others of your colleagues who would retire, should I then be too doubtful of the extent of his means if I imagined that nothing wd. remain for him but to seek for aid from the Opposition? I have no right to answer for what any other person may do; & I have seen too much of the Duke of Wellington not to be aware that until the moment for decision arrives he never will commit himself by hasty declarations. Lord Bathurst, however, could tell you what was strikingly the effect when it was lightly hinted that in your opinion the King might usefully have recourse to Canning. This occurred after I had seen you on Sunday. I would say anything to the Duke that you might think desirable; but after what passed I could not without pain press upon him what, if I mistake not, he would consider as offensive to himself & as unsafe for the public service. Whenever there has been [a] question of what it might be necessary to do if you were irrecoverably lost, his sole & unvarying observation has been that he will think of nothing but of preserving you. He has indeed since the mention that was made of Canning, expressed to me the distress he shd. feel in having to inform the King that he also must abandon him; & it could not escape me that he was saying this in reference to the possibility of Canning being the Minister.

The Duke of Wellington's influence is military & not civil. Were he to retire while you remained, his loss wd. be lamented, but there it would stop. Were he (perhaps also accompanied by others) to retire in conjunction with all of you, the effect, in my opinion, would be great indeed. I have no conception how it would be possible for Canning, after such loppings off, to abstain from going to the Opposition.

I have been anxious not to overstate what I suppose is passing in the Duke of Wellington's mind. I have not seen or heard from Lord Bathurst since he met the Duke in my room; but if you talk to him you will learn whether the impression upon his mind was the same as upon mine.

Had this crisis arisen some years ago I could not have been unbiassed. Your kindness to me & to those belonging to me has enabled me to throw aside all selfish motives; but I do dread your resignation as being fraught with injury to yourself, & with incalculable mischief to the public. With this I conclude. Rejoiced shall I be if the dissensions among our opponents on the very question which is to cause you to retire, & if the decreasing majority in the H. of Commons should induce you to pause. However this may be, & whatever may be your ultimate determination, I pray that it may redound to your credit and give you repose.

#### 69. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

19 May 1825. *Private & confidential*.— . . . Canning wishes to see the Duke tomorrow before the Cabinet, to let him know that it is summon'd upon the Cath. question. Let not this go beyond ourselves. I saw him today; he was not at all *violent*, but he felt that the question can no longer remain in *abeyance*; that it must be *settled* in one way or another. I listen'd but

say'd nothing except as matter of explanation. My speech<sup>1</sup> had been represented to him as the *most violent* that ever had been made on any subject. Wynn, the Grenvilles, Plunket &c could not endure it; he did not mind this, but it became necessary to bring matters to a crisis. He thinks it a just compliment to the Duke to see him before the Cabinet. He means to see no one else, but permitted me to inform Peel what had passed between us. I will certainly not see the Duke of B[uckingham] before the Cabinet. Send this note on to the Duke of Wn. and beg him to burn it.

#### 70. Earl Bathurst to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Cirencester, 14 August 1825.*— . . . From what Liverpool said to me when I last saw him, I suspect that at Canning's last visit at Coombe, there had been an explanation with respect to the business on which we meet in September, & that they have agreed upon it.<sup>2</sup> But you may depend upon it you will find Canning has been beforehand with him *in many places*.

*Ibid., Cirencester, 16 September 1825.*—I send you back Lord L[iverpool]'s letter. I had understood that our meeting was fixed for Tuesday the 20th, & have made my arrangements accordingly.

I happen'd to see a letter from William Courtenay, in which he deprecated a dissolution of Parliament as being in the present temper fatal to his interests at Exeter. Wilmot Horton, I find, is equally alarm'd, & if there should be one or two men whose deprecatory representations shall reach Canning, I make no doubt it will be fatal to the measure, altho' I do not see how it can help them, unless they mean next session not to vote for the measure, as the cry will not die away, by another contest next session.

*Enclosed:* The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Walmer Castle, 9 September 1825. Private.*— . . . We had a most agreeable tour, which we extended to The Hague & Amsterdam. Lady Liverpool was much pleased with an opportunity of seeing Holland, & it answer'd thoroughly to me, who had been in that country before, though at a distance of thirty-five years. I never saw any country in a more improving & flourishing condition than the *whole* of the kingdom of the Netherlands. The difference in going from or returning to France is very striking, though France is certainly improving.

Lushington has been with me here for a day, and I have done as much with him as, in the present *undecided* state of the question, can be done. It is right that you should know that I consider the question quite *undecided*, nor will it be possible to bring it to a *point* till we meet on the 22d. I propose to be in town on the 20th in order that I may have an entire day before the Cabinet meets. I rather wish you to come up upon the same day. I will

<sup>1</sup> On the 17th (*Parl. Deb.*, N.S., xiii. 739).

<sup>2</sup> In September Canning persuaded Liverpool to postpone the dissolution of parliament until the following year. The 'Protestant' ministers were in favour of an immediate general election, which, they were confident, would weaken the 'Catholic' party.

be obliged to you not to take any step to summon Shaftesbury,<sup>1</sup> not to encourage his coming, if he should offer it. I will explain to you the reason when we meet. . . .

### 71. Charles Arbuthnot to Sir William Knighton.

*Broadlands, 10 October 1825. Copy.*—I have received a letter from Sir C. Long which makes it necessary that I should request you to take for me the King's pleasure.

During my illness, and being myself unable to submit to his Majesty plans for new lodges & gates at Hyde Park Corner, & at the top of Constitution Hill, I desired Long to do thus for me. With a trifling alteration in the windows of the lodges I learnt with pleasure that the King approved of the plans which I had ordered to be prepared; & in consequence of their having been thus sanctioned by his Majesty, I received the authority of the Treasury to have the works executed. I am now informed by Long that it is not the King's pleasure to have the gates & lodges which had been intended to be placed at the top of Constitution Hill. I had hoped that the suggestions which I had ventured to make to appropriate the Lodge & Centre Gate to the King's own use, and thus to form the entrance for a private road to his Majesty would have been approved.

It is, however, as much my most anxious wish as it is my duty to have carried into execution whatever may be the King's pleasure, and therefore it is that I request you humbly to intreat his Majesty to give his commands to the Treasury in order that I may be authorised to carry them into effect.

According to the original plan the gates at Hyde Park Corner would have been placed some feet nearer to Knightsbridge, for the purpose of their being exactly opposite to those which were to be erected on the top of Constitution Hill. The space of ground thus left would, by command of the King, have been given to the Duke of Wellington. In the narrowest part the Duke would have got 10 feet, and I believe about 30 in the widest. As, however, there could be no public reason for placing the Hyde Park gates lower down unless they were to correspond with those on the opposite side of Piccadilly, it would, as the Duke informs me, be very unsatisfactory to him, to receive any addition to his garden. He feels that had the gates been moved in conformity to the original plan, the gift of the additional piece of ground, while it was a most gratifying mark of the King's kindness, would have appeared natural, and could not have been thought an encroachment. But it would be painful to the Duke to have the gates placed lower down for his accommodation; and as he is sure that it would appear in no other light to the public, he has signified to me that he is desirous of respectfully declining to have any change made in the boundary of his garden.

Under all these circumstances I have not known how to proceed; the line of the intended pleasure ground which is to be drawn from the lodge

<sup>1</sup> Government whip in the house of lords, and chairman of committees. Lushington acted as parliamentary secretary to the treasury.

at Stanhope St. to the gates at Hyde Park Corner was formed upon the idea that the position of these was to be altered. But as the Duke of Wellington is now unwilling to take into his garden the piece of ground which was intended for him ; it has become necessary to have the whole plan reconsidered, & to know what will be the King's pleasure respecting it before I proceed further.

I have therefore thought that it was my duty to wait until I was honoured with his Majesty's commands ; and to avoid the possibility of falling into error, I have given orders that for the moment the works which were in progress should be suspended. I hope you will have the goodness to take an opportunity of submitting to his Majesty that in conformity to what I have heard from Sir C. Long I shall wait till his commands shall have been signified ; and that when they are communicated to me they shall be executed with the most earnest desire on my part to merit his approbation

I have been for some time engaged in the inspection of the New Forest. Our triennial report is to be made next session & we have been employed in collecting all the necessary information.

I would not leave London till I had obtained Lord Liverpool's sanction to the fishing temple, and the bridge. There would have been no difficulty if the whole of our surplus revenue had not been mortgaged by Act of Parliament to Buckingham Palace ; but I should not do justice to Lord Liverpool if I did not say, that he had the most anxious desire to find the means of meeting the King's pleasure.

#### 72. Sir William Knighton to Charles Arbuthnot.

*King's Lodge, 12 October 1825. Private.*—I am honor'd with the commands of the King, to send you his Majesty's kind regards, & to assure you that his Majesty is very sensible of your earnest, dutiful and affectionate attention in all that relates to his Majesty's public concerns & private comforts.

The object which his Majesty had in view relative to the new Lodges, about to be erected at Hyde Park Corner, was merely a question of taste, as it struck H.M.'s mind, upon the face of the plan submitted ; but the moment H.M. was convinced, from the plain & sensible statement which you transmitted to me, that the proposed arrangements respecting the Duke of Wellington's house & garden would be interfered with, his Majesty commands me to desire that you will be so good as to proceed in your *original* plan without delay ; for in everything that has reference to the Duke of Wellington, H.M. commands me to add, his best feelings are involved, by all the ties of the most sincere & affectionate friendship.<sup>1</sup>

#### 73. The Earl of Liverpool \* to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Walmer Castle, 17 October 1825. Private & confidential.*— . . . Your intelligence respecting Lord Wellesley was not new to me—I had a letter <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The letter was endorsed. 'Most entirely app[rove]d G.R.'

<sup>2</sup> *George IV corresp.*, iii 126.

from him several days ago to announce his intended marriage. The most awkward circumstance in this connection is, that the lady <sup>1</sup> is a Roman Catholic, and I need not add, that under the circumstances in which he is placed at present, this may add to all the other embarrassments connected with the Catholic question. If she had been a Protestant, I should not have thought the marriage, upon the whole, disadvantageous to him. The lady has no family, nor any connections which can be inconvenient to him, and she will draw him forth from those secluded habits which are wholly incompatible with his public character, and are in many ways discreditable to him. She will certainly govern him, but if she has sense, as I believe she has, from some things which have come to my knowledge, I am persuaded that, in the common concerns of life at least, she will govern him better than he will govern himself. . . .

#### 74. The Duke of Wellington to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*London, 14 May 1826.*—I hope your cold is better this morning. Mine is better; but I don't think I shall go out till late in the day.

I don't see anything in *John Bull* about your attire.<sup>2</sup> I have not seen the *Observer*. I conclude that it was too late. If you are to see Herries and desire him to direct the *Morning Post & New Times* to put down your dress as that of Mary Queen of Scots after a picture in enamel by Bone, naturally in the description of the Ball it would do good. I have been thinking all night of what should be done with the *Times*; and I think that the conclusion to which I have come is either to take no notice or to prosecute. The proceeding of which I thought yesterday was very dry and dignified. But the editor<sup>3</sup> may and probably would treat the subject with levity; contradict the fact that it was male attire, but still assert that the dress was remarkable and had that appearance; by which proceeding he would leave the sting in the paragraph at the same time that he would be no longer liable to prosecution. An insolent, vulgar fellow as the editor of the *Times* is, would do this; & therefore I came to the conclusion to take no notice of him or to prosecute him.

You'll see Cecil<sup>4</sup> this day probably, and you might ask him whether the paragraph is not a libel. I send you the *Times* for that purpose. If it is so in his opinion, we might take the Attorney General's<sup>5</sup> opinion upon it to-

<sup>1</sup> A wealthy widow, Mrs. Patterson, an American lady.

<sup>2</sup> A fancy dress ball was held at Covent Garden Theatre on the 12th, for the benefit of the distressed Spitalfields weavers. 'The fancy dress', said *The Times* (13 May), 'which seemed to attract most curiosity was that of Mrs. Arbuthnot, who, habited in Eastern male attire, walked about the room, leaning on the arm of the Duke of Wellington.' There was no correction of the mis-statement. *John Bull* on the 14th, said: 'An evening paper states that Mrs. Arbuthnot appeared at the Fancy Ball on Friday evening in Eastern male attire. This is not true, the costume worn by that lady was that of Mary Queen of Scots.'

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Barnes.

<sup>4</sup> Cecil Jenkinson, the prime minister's half-brother.

<sup>5</sup> Sir John Copley.



morrow; & the whole case might be ready for Arbuthnot's consideration when he should come to town. It appears to me to be just a case for prosecution. The insolence turns upon a simple fact; and there is nothing of which there could be a doubt in the whole case.<sup>1</sup>

#### 75. Mrs. Arbuthnot to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Tuesday* [<sup>?</sup> 16 May 1826].— . . . I confess I am *amazed* at yr. not being anxious to have it contradicted that I went to a ball in *man's cloths*! I do not see how it is possible to accuse a lady of more gross indecency, & tho' all my London friends saw that I was not in *man's cloths*, there are quantities in the country whose good opinion I value, who wd. have believed it, & I certainly cd. not have allowed such a statement to go uncontradicted. If you had read the *John Bull* you wd. have seen that it was contradicted in a manner that cd. not possibly excite animadversion, & all I did was to take care I was not put into the other papers as wearing man's cloths. However, if it had caused all the remarks in the world I cd. not have allowed such a statement to go uncontradicted, & I am quite certain that the reason the newspapers are become the intolerable nuisance they are, is because nobody dares attack them. I have done nothing to cause me to be the least afraid of them, & I have no notion of being accused of indecency without contradicting it. I confess I wd. give anything to prosecute the *Times* for it, but at all events I hope the mischief is done away by the other papers putting in the truth. I send you a note I have just had from the Duke. He thinks with me that it was quite necessary to contradict it. Pray do not be angry at my being *warm* upon this subject, but I do think there is nothing so offensive as a charge of indecency. . . .

#### 76. Sir Henry Wellesley to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Vienna, 8 August 1826. Private.*— . . . I feel extremely obliged to the Duke of Wellington for what he has stated to Mr. Canning. I believe you know that I date my pretensions to a peerage as far back as 1814; although I am very far from pretending to any share in the successes which led to the liberation of Spain. I will not bore you now with a detail of the services upon which I found my claims, but if peerages are ever granted for diplomatic services, I think I could make out my claims to be undeniable even at the period I have mentioned.

At the same time nothing would give me greater pain than to stand in the way of Sir Charles Stuart's obtaining that distinction. I do not believe it to be at all in the contemplation of Mr. Canning to propose me for a peerage, and I should be sorry were my pretensions to be cited as precluding him from

<sup>1</sup> On the 14th the *Observer*, and next day the *Morning Post* and *New Times* inserted denials of *The Times'* story, similar to that published in *John Bull*

proposing Stuart for a mark of distinction to which he is justly entitled. Perhaps you could have the goodness to mention my feelings upon this subject to the Duke of Wellington, who might say to Mr. Canning that if there is any intention of calling Sir C. Stuart to the peerage, and that I am an obstacle to his obtaining that distinction, I beg I may not stand in his way.

Do not imagine however that I am not fully sensible of the value of a peerage, and that I am not aware how much it would be for my advantage at this Court that it should be conferred upon me now, but I cannot bear the idea of standing in the way of another person's obtaining it, whose pretensions are as well founded as mine . . .<sup>1</sup>

Metternich is not here. He was a good deal irritated and annoyed at the Emperor of Brazil's decrees,<sup>2</sup> but is coming round again.

### 77. Earl Bathurst to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Cirencester.* 13 September 1826.—I had been for the last two or three days thinking of writing to you to ask if Lord Liverpool had answer'd your letter, when I receiv'd this morning your letter inclosing his.<sup>3</sup> If he had stopp'd with his own defence, he would have judged better. I confess I have never understood what is the extent of the reproach which has been cast upon poor Gerald, but I must in fairness acknowledge that the great authorities which he quotes, viz. Peel, Goulburn & the Primate, justify his decision.<sup>4</sup> The catalogue of the favors bestow'd upon the Duke's family<sup>5</sup> is in very bad taste, but not having seen your letter I cannot say whether you provoked it. As things are, you had better leave matters where they are. However grand Lord Liverpool may write, you may depend upon it that he is sufficiently alarm'd. If you had heard him on the Portuguese question in the Cabinet last Saturday week, you would have seen how unwilling he was not to attend to the Duke's wishes. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Sir Henry Wellesley had been minister, or ambassador, to Spain, 1810-21, and ambassador at Vienna since 1823. He was created Baron Cowley in January 1828. Sir Charles Stuart, ambassador at Paris, 1815-24, was created Baron Stuart de Rothesay in 1828.

<sup>2</sup> Granting a constitution to Portugal. See C. K. Webster, *Britain and the independence of Latin America*, ii. 38, for Wellesley's detailed account of Metternich's views.

<sup>3</sup> See Yonge's *Liverpool*, iii. 392 (8 September).

<sup>4</sup> Liverpool refused to make Wellington's brother Gerald a bishop, on the ground that he was living apart from his wife and had abstained from suing for a divorce. The heated correspondence between the duke and the prime minister is in Yonge's *Liverpool*, iii. 383-91.

<sup>5</sup> A pension for the duke's mother and his sister; an office for his brother-in-law Charles Culling Smith; and office and a peerage for his brother Wellesley-Pole (Lord Maryborough) [Yonge's *Liverpool*, iii. 392].

<sup>6</sup> 'The Duke', said Arbuthnot, 'has been dissatisfied with much of the management of our foreign relations ever since we lost Lord Londonderry. He is resolved to be no party to what he may think would involve this country in war; and if efforts are not made to prevent collision between Spain and Portugal, and if that collision should take place, he will, I am certain, write to you that he must withdraw from the Cabinet.' (Yonge's *Liverpool*, iii. 395. See, too, *Bathurst papers*, 615; and *W.N.D.*, iii. 381 sqq.)

## 78. Viscount Palmerston to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Sligo, 15 October 1826.*—I was delighted to hear that the lillies succeeded so well, & that the *bella donna* held sway in your garden as well as in your boudoir; I am very little in a condition to make any adequate return for your entertaining letters, as I have been for three weeks in these remote & barbarous regions, where I could only send you scandalous stories about Irwins and Hanleys & O'Connors, & people of whose existence you are unconscious. I am here trying to civilize some thousands of natives who own me as their landlord & are willing to *owe* me rent for their acres & half acres, & though great changes cannot be effected suddenly, I do not despair of persuading them in the course of time even to wear clothes. In the meantime they are the only people I have met with this year who do not complain of the season. The potatoes are so abundant that, as a man said, they are kicking each other out of the ridges, wheat we have little or none, but barley & oats have been better than in England. The Grand National quarrel, however, is going on as briskly as ever, & if it can afford anybody satisfaction to see a whole nation by the ears, like an undisciplined pack of hounds, instead of seeing them employed in the pursuits of industry, & in carrying forward the prosperity of the Empire, the present state of Ireland must be very satisfactory. The country indeed is in all respects highly favoured, for besides this interminable quarrel which occupies the upper & middling classes, there is going on all over Ireland with respect to the lower class of peasantry a revolution of the greatest magnitude, & accompanied by the most extensive & tremendous misery. The landlords have discovered, what it did not require any rising from the dead to tell them, that their estates are over-peopled both for their own profit & for the comfort of their tenantry, & so they have set to work to correct this evil. The habit of the country has been this: a man got forty or fifty years ago a lease of, we will say, twenty acres of land for a long term; he immediately let off fifteen acres to three other men, reserving five perhaps for himself. He then had three sons and a daughter, & gave to each son as he came of age one acre, & another to his daughter's husband as her marriage portion; each of the other three men perhaps did the same, and when the lease expires the landlord finds his 20 acres which were let to one man, occupied by twenty families. This to be sure is an evil, but the remedy adopted is a greater. The landlord proceeds to *thin* his tenantry exactly as in England we hoe our turnips. He tells half the population or more to go about their business & leave his land. They remonstrate, they say there were bred & born on his estate, that there is no demand for their labour either in agriculture or manufactures, that to America they cannot go because they have not the means to pay their passage, that if he turns them adrift they have no place to lay their heads, & that they must perish on the roads or the bogs. To all this the *improving* landlord is deaf; to their question where will we go, what will become of us, he replies, 'that is your own concern, not mine, & go to the devil if you like it'. This is an everyday case, & when you ask a man what he supposes to have become of

these wretches, he says very calmly, 'I really do not know, I never happened to inquire about them'. The Irish must be a strange, discontented race of men not to be happy & well-behaved under so benignant a dispensation. Scapin says in Molière, 'je rends grâces à Dieu de tous les malheurs qui ne m'arrivent pas,' & an Englishman coming here may do the same for the méchancetés dont il n'est pas coupable. Well, Heavens & earth, as Robinson <sup>1</sup> would say, what a prosing letter to write to a lady!, but I beg your pardon & will try to do better when I have better materials; the coat must be cut according to the cloth. I was only a few hours in Dublin, & did not see the Marchioness,<sup>2</sup> which I shall probably do on my return . . .

### 79. The Earl of Liverpool to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Coombe Wood, 16 December 1826. Private.*—I have had an answer from the King, by which it appears to have been evidently his wish to confer the Garter upon the Duke of Devonshire, & though he probably would not have *insisted* upon it he would have been disappointed if it had not been done.<sup>3</sup>

I must say that the giving the Govt. of Plymouth to the Duke of Gloucester is a greater *blow* upon me than two or three blue ribbons to Opposition peers, but I do not mean to object to it or to say anything against it.

*Ibid., Coombe Wood, 20 December 1826.\* Private & most confidential.*—I have received your notes respecting the Government of Plymouth. I had previously heard from the King, and I immediately wrote to the Duke of W[ellington] to say how entirely satisfied I was that he should hold both, as Lord Cornwallis had done before him.

If the Duke thinks it right however to resign Plymouth upon receiving the Tower, I hope his recommendation of Lord Hill will be adopted. The King will not hear of the Duke of Gloucester. I told you in my former note that I should not have objected to it, but I think it would have been a most unseemly appointment. The Duke has no military claims of any kind. He has been a most offensive politician, and I think his being a Prince of the blood is in itself a strong objection to such an appointment.<sup>4</sup>

With respect to the Blue Ribbon, I knew that the King was very anxious about the Duke of Devonshire, and I understand that all the world expected he would have it upon the present occasion. It might have been wrong to send him to Moscow,<sup>5</sup> but having sent him there, and a Ribbon becoming vacant <sup>6</sup> just upon his return, it appeared to be a natural consequence, particularly considering his very high rank & station in the country. If we had had any *great* Tory Peer with *paramount* claims to such a distinction, I should have felt great difficulties, but all our *great Dukes* have the Order of the Garter. The Marquis of Exeter has just received a considerable favor, and may therefore

<sup>1</sup> The chancellor of the exchequer.

<sup>2</sup> Wellesley.

<sup>3</sup> See *George IV corresp.*, III, 188–90.

<sup>4</sup> Wellington resigned the governorship of Plymouth which he had held since 1819, Earl Harcourt succeeding him.

<sup>5</sup> On a special mission to attend Nicholas I's coronation (3 September 1826).

<sup>6</sup> By the death of the marquess of Hastings.

wait.<sup>1</sup> The Duke of Richmond is still young, especially as he has no great following nor influence in the country. I rather inclined to Lord Powis of the three you named—but *entre nous* he is not very *presentable*. I do not think either of these three will be offended at the Duke of Devonshire having the Order under all the circumstances which have attended it.

You will be glad to hear that I am considerably better, but still weak, and I feel as if much work would again upset me.

I have another letter from Robinson. He is evidently most anxious to get out of his present situation. You may rely upon my using every effort to dissuade him, for I feel strongly that whether the Government is to stand or not, it ought not to be overturned in this way, and yet I protest I do not see how I could overcome the difficulties if he was finally to determine to resign. The less is said however upon this subject the better.<sup>2</sup>

#### 80. Lady Charlotte Greville to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Bruxelles*, 1 *January* 1827.—Your letter as well as all those I have recd. by this mail upon the subject of the poor dear D. of York have caused me the greatest affliction—indeed the preceding accts. left me no hope, & it is impossible to say with what grief & dismay I contemplate his loss—irreparable as it is to the country & to my family in particular. There never will be, I am convinced, a Commr.-in-Chief so deservedly popular as he has been—nor any Prince so much regretted. I do hope that Parlt. will rescue his memory from the only stain which has been fixed upon his character while living, & that his debts will be paid. It wd perhaps be better if the King were, out of his immense private income, to do this. I shd. think he might well afford it if the C——<sup>3</sup> family wd. allow him—but I cannot think that the country wd. object—it ought to be considered that he is one of the oldest publick servts. All men agree that he has discharged his trust with the greatest advantage to his country, & with singular probity & impartiality—& it shd. not be forgotten that his unwearied assiduity, attention, & care provided the means with which the Duke of W[ellington] effected such mighty results. Surely, then, these services hitherto unrewarded ought not to be passed over without notice, without reward? . . .<sup>4</sup>

#### 81. John Cam Hobhouse to Charles Arbuthnot.

*London*, 18 *April* 1827.— . . . It gives me great pleasure to be informed by you that you did not find me very troublesome in transmitting the occasional complaints & more frequent apprehensions of some of my constituents to your

<sup>1</sup> He became a K G in May 1827.

<sup>2</sup> Robinson wanted a peerage and some office less strenuous than that of chancellor of the exchequer. 'The Catholic question in its present state,' Liverpool told him, 'combined with other circumstances, will, I have little doubt, lead to its [the Government's] dissolution in the course of this session; and any attempt to make a *move* now, in the more efficient offices, would infallibly hasten the crisis.' (Yonge's *Liverpool*, III 438-42)

<sup>3</sup> Conyngham.

<sup>4</sup> See *George IV corresp.*, III. 197

office. It is hardly necessary for me to add that in all my communications with you I find such a reception as takes away the merit of forbearance on my part—and I am quite sure that whatever may be the consequences of the present great changes—even should the Pope be at the Treasury and the Cardinal Deacon preside over his Majesty's Woods & Forests, I shall, as long as I am member for Westminster, regret your absence from Whitehall Place. Urbanity and sincerity are seldom the virtues in waiting at the Public Offices—and when seen at all are rarely seen together.

### 82. The Duchess of Wellington to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Stratfieldsaye, 1 May 1827.*—A thousand thanks for your kind compliance with my wish, in the midst of your own business and hurry. Impossible, quite impossible it should last.<sup>1</sup> You may imagine the agitation with which I look for the intelligence that tomorrow's post may bring. Indeed, the agitation of this time is almost more than I can bear.

Do you recollect what day this is? It is the Duke's birthday! On this day last year we dined with you, we were together! He was lately returned from Russia,<sup>2</sup> and in high spirits and in high favour! And now I am here alone, and most anxious, while [he] is probably with you! Pray for me, Mrs Arbuthnot, it will be praying for me to wish everything good to him. He feels far more deeply & often more painfully than he allows himself to express, and I cannot but apprehend that he often suffers that which none suspect.

I have heard nothing of going to town, in fact I have heard no intelligence but from you. I shall be ready to go when sent to. Will you frank a letter to Charley for me? If it is ready by the time the post goes out I will enclose it, but perhaps you no longer frank. Will you tell me how that is? God bless you.

[P.S.] It is now 5 o'clock! I suppose the House to be assembling.<sup>3</sup> God help us all!

### 83. Earl Bathurst to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Dropmore, 4 July 1827. Private.*— . . . I hear that the Duke is to meet Lord Grey at dinner at Lord Ellenborough's next Sunday. I wish he might have an opportunity somehow or other to prevent Lord Grey committing himself on the Greek question.<sup>4</sup> Lord Holland & Lord Lansdown will cer-

<sup>1</sup> Canning's ministry, that is

<sup>2</sup> He had been sent on a special mission of condolence and congratulation on the accession of Nicholas I.

<sup>3</sup> After the Easter recess In both houses the ex-ministers explained their resignations.

<sup>4</sup> Grey was changing his views on the Near Eastern question. In 1826 he was still in favour of the expulsion of the Turks from Europe, even at the hands of Russia, but he was soon to denounce the Treaty of London (6 July 1827), by which Great Britain, France and Russia undertook to compel the Turks to acknowledge a practically independent Greek State, as impolitic and unjust. The ultra-tories thoroughly mistrusted Canning's foreign policy and were strongly anti-Russian

tainly attempt to make private communication with him on that subject, and his Lordship's principles will lead him to favor insurrections. But it appears to me that what is going on is a system of unusual injustice & improvidence. Putting aside the right of interference, we are first demanding for the vanquish'd the terms of victors. 2ly, having remonstrated with the Turks for threatening to transport the Greeks from Greece, as an extremity of warfare not to be tolerated in civilised Europe, we are, by requiring the expulsion of the Turks from Greece, practising towards our Allies in time of peace the same measure, which we declared to be too bad for the Turks to commit against their antagonists in time of war. And lastly, we are inviting into the Mediterranean a Russian fleet (which it has been always our policy to keep out from thence) to assist us in doing what our own fleet (if it be fit to be done) is fully equal to do alone, without much increase of our naval establishment; or what the French fleet in conjunction with ours (if out of policy we wish'd to act with France) is more than equal to accomplish without any increase whatever. Without a port in the Mediterranean where Russia can repair her fleet, she has a fair pretence to obtain the occupation of some one of the Greek islands for that ostensible purpose, & if the Greeks are willing to concede it to their co-religionists (and what will not the Greeks be on that ground not ready to concede?) Mr Canning will not have it in his power either to refuse the Russians such a station, or induce them to withdraw their fleet. He will thus entail upon us the expense of keeping up a rival naval establishment, which after all will only neutralise the danger which we shall have invited.

I am satisfied Lord Anglesey has been doing some mischief at Windsor,<sup>1</sup> & I suppose that there is some final arrangement with respect to the Commander-in-Chief, as Sr. Herbert Taylor told me at Lord Farnborough's that the King had now given him leave to resign whenever an arrangement was open, which Sr. Herbert would think suitable.<sup>2</sup>

*Ibid.*, Cirencester, 8 July 1827.—Many thanks for your very amusing letter. The picture which Holmes & Herries give of what is going on is probably somewhat colour'd, but even after making large allowances, there is enough left, coupled with Planta's exclamations, to shew that all is not going on right.<sup>3</sup> I am, however, very much inclined to think that it is as much owing to Canning's jealousies as to Whig importunities. It must, however, be confess'd that he has some reason to be jealous if they keep so separate as not to allow Treasury notes to be sent to them.

The idea of abolishing the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland is one which I remember hearing was popular before Easter among the young politician

<sup>1</sup> It was arranged that he should succeed Wellesley as lord-lieutenant of Ireland; there had been some talk of his succeeding Wellington as commander-in-chief of the army.

<sup>2</sup> Lieutenant-general Sir Herbert Taylor, military secretary to the commander-in-chief since January, was appointed deputy secretary at war after Wellington's resignation of the office of commander-in-chief. Wellington resumed it in August, after Canning's death.

<sup>3</sup> See *Formation of Canning's ministry*, No. 340, and Introduction, lvi.

viz. Dennison, Wortley,<sup>1</sup> &c., & this probably made Canning less indisposed to the idea.

Apsley tells me that he was told in great confidence that Lord Mount Charles had resigned his seat at the Treasury Board<sup>2</sup>—certainly not from any love for the seceders, whom he abuses but it is supposed more from domestic differences with his parents than from any other cause. Both Canning & the King offer'd him a peerage, which he declined.

Lord Carnarvon was at Lord Grenville's. They both spoke of Lord Lansdown being to be [*sic*] the Home Secretary as a matter settled, & to take place immediately. Lord Grenville, I perceive, does not at all approve of a Russian fleet entering the Mediterranean. He said that he had *understood* our joining with the French in the Greek business was for the purpose of preventing the Russians having a pretence to interfere *there*.

#### 84: Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

Woodford, 9 August 1827.— . . . You will have heard of poor Canning's death. By that fatal event every feeling but that of sorrow for his family & friends is gone. . . .

#### 85. William Holmes to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

10, Grafton Street, 13 August 1827.—I enclose you a correct list of the new Administration, & which Lord Goderich has this day taken down to the King, whose hand he has by this time kissed as Premier. Herries is come to town to give his reply in person to the offer made him yesterday by letter. My opinion is that he will accept.<sup>3</sup> After those arrangements are finally concluded the King will undertake to prevail on the Duke to accept the army. I shall make no comment as I am in office.<sup>4</sup>

#### 86. Sir Henry Hardinge to Charles Arbuthnot.

14 August [1827].—I rather believe the Duke has sent you my letters,<sup>5</sup> on the scraps of news picked up in the streets, & I therefore need not revert to what I have said regarding Lord Lyndhurst's sentiments & opinions, & his reported conversation with the K[ing]. Today I hear that his friends have discovered a plot between C[annin]g & Brougham, to have displaced him, made Scarlet Chancellor, & Brougham Att. Genl. This is what his friends say.

His enemies say that he has been found so deficient in *intellect* for equity law that it is a complete failure & that the Chancery Bar are getting up a

<sup>1</sup> Both Canningite M.P.s. See *The Canningite party* (R. Hist. Soc., *Transactions*, 4th Series, xvii 177 sqq.).

<sup>2</sup> He resigned only in April 1830.

<sup>3</sup> Herries became chancellor of the exchequer.

<sup>4</sup> He was treasurer of the ordnance and tory whip

<sup>5</sup> *W N.D.*, iv. 73, 75, 77, 79, 89 (8 to 13 August).



petition or statement to cause him to be set aside. Also I hear that he was £20,000 in debt before his elevation, & that he has raised *since* a like sum by securing his life, to meet expences & purchases chiefly of his wife's, & that this feeling of his heavy debt is to be brought to bear as matter of depression agt. him.

The next piece of street [news] is that Theodore Hook dined with *Leake* & 3 other gossips at the Cocoa Tree—that Theodore was late, & charged a man high in office with the blame, who had written to him to come to him & discuss in his next Sunday's paper,<sup>1</sup> the policy of forming a Govt. under Ld. Gooderich with Lord Lansdowne & Tierney & the present men of any ability, but taking in the Duke, Peel, Ld. Melville & *Ld. Grey*. He discussed this policy very freely, was the cock of the company, but firm as to the necessity of the D. & Peel. This I had from Leake as well as the report regarding Ld. Lyndhurst.

With respect to Ld. Eldon, Ld. Camden saw him yesterday. He said he never could resume his office, & indeed considered it wd. be more creditable to him *never to take any office*—& that he should cordially support but never be in the way. I conceive Ld. Camden *ferretted* out this point in consequence of Peel having told him he apprehended the old Ch[ancellor] looked back to his official situation as belonging to him of *right*. Ld. Gooderich kissed hands yesterday. Herries, it is said, has not given a decided answer. Littleton, who is come from France to attend C——g's funeral, said today that the Hse. of Coms. part of the Govt. was not to be settled till Huskisson returned or answered the overtures made to him.<sup>2</sup> Littleton tells me the country Tories as well as Whigs consider the D. of W. will be ruined if he declines the Army. That they reckon upon him as their great card is evident in all quarters, for Clanwilliam told me he had written yesterday to press the Duke & prepare him for the offer, & that it wd. be Robinson's *grand coup*. My observation was no man knew what the D. decision wd. be, but I thought Robinson wd. be maladroit to ask a superior man, who had hitherto sat at the upper end of the same table, now to serve behind his chair. . .

### 87. Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Maresfield, 17 August 1827.*— . . . I have long foreseen that the Catholic question must place me in the position in which I am at present. If Lord Liverpool had lived, the great probability is that he and I would have been out of office at this time. I do not at all regret either that the King did not send for me after Canning's death—still less do I regret that I have received no communication from Lord Goderich. It would not have been an easy matter for the Duke of Wellington and for me—to form under existing circumstances a strong Government in the House of Commons. In the first place, after the line which the King has taken on the Catholic question—that question would have embarrassed us exceedingly.

<sup>1</sup> *John Bull*.

<sup>2</sup> He was then recruiting his health on the Continent.

In the second place—both Canning's friends and adherents—and of course the Whigs—would have been glad of the opportunity of throwing every difficulty in the way, and the effect of the recent death of Canning would have been to unite his Tory and his Whig adherents in a closer union than ever yet existed between them, or than probably will exist for the future.

Canning's death, and the loss of the succession to him would have been powerful cements to a party that must be rather disjointed. I was asked to meet the Duke at Lord Bathurst's at Cirencester. He is to be here today.

I heard some days since that Lord Melville had had an offer from Lord Goderich. *Will he accept?* I had a letter from him (Lord M.) yesterday in answer to two which I had written to him. His letter is dated the 12th.

I should think it not improbable that the King had made my exclusion from office a *sine quâ non* on the appointment of Lord Goderich. It is very natural in a man, and particularly when that man is a King, to hate another who declines to trust him.

P.S. I am most positively assured that a seat in the Cabinet, and the choice of an office has been offered to Lowther.<sup>1</sup> If this be so, it is, I suppose, on the advice of Lady Lyndhurst. But what will the Whigs—what will Brougham say to it?

*Ibid.*, Maresfield, 19 August, 1827. *Most private*.—Today's post brought me your letter of the 17th and one from the Duke inclosing copies of letters from the King and Lord Goderich, and notifying his acceptance of the command of the Army.

I think it would not be fair towards the Duke to take into the account the effect which his acceptance may have on the state of parties and the politics of the day. I do not think that considering the grounds on which he gave up the command of the Army<sup>2</sup>—the grounds on which he declined resuming it when previously offered by the King<sup>3</sup> considering what he owes to the Army—and military service generally—I do not think he could with propriety reject the offer which the King has now made him.

I cannot very clearly foresee the issue of the present state of things—the accession of the Duke of Wellington will no doubt give material strength to the Government—because they will get his opinion on every question with which military matters are concerned—and because his opinion is worth more than that of all the present Cabinet—and will be most thankfully acquiesced in, I have no doubt, by every individual member of it.

I view all that passes as far as I am personally concerned, with very great complacency. Whatever I may think of some persons—I feel quite satisfied that no course of action would either be justifiable or successful that was not founded on a public principle. I dare say the King made my exclusion a *sine quâ non*. If he did, it gives me no mortification—nor will it at all influence my politics. . . .<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *George IV corresp.*, iii. 279; *Bathurst papers*, p. 643.

<sup>2</sup> See *W.N.D.*, iv. 1 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 35-7 (21-2 May).

<sup>4</sup> Parts of these letters are in *Parker's Peel*, ii. 9.

## 88. Viscount Melville to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Melville Castle, 19 August 1827. Private.*— . . . I have no hesitation in stating my entire concurrence in your view of the question as to the Duke of Wellington's return to the Horse Guards, & to say the whole truth, it always appeared to me fortunate for him that he had so good an ostensible reason for resigning the command four months ago. I think that if he accepted it now, he would find himself in an uncomfortable situation, unless he determined either to support the Government, or to abandon politics & party altogether, & not to enter the House of Lords or give his proxy. To either of those alternatives I have no doubt he would decidedly object, & the only remaining course is to decline the offer, which I hope he will have done if it has been made. The Duke of York, if he chose it, might keep aloof from politics, or he might even support the Ministers of his father & brother, let those Ministers be who they might. But the Duke of Wellington would be frozen up in such a position, & would never submit to it. Whatever might be his real opinion on any military measure of the Government, it would infallibly be sent forth to the world under his name & authority, though his share in it might have been merely executive. Those grounds, coupled with the insufficiency of the Administration to carry on the public business, appear to me fully sufficient to justify the Duke in refusing at present to resume the command of the Army.

As for myself, I have told Peel that being comfortably deposited here, I have no wish to return to public life. If circumstances should arise to render it a matter of duty to obey any such call (which I think improbable), I must of course submit & obey it, & at any rate I feel that it might be injurious in some respects if I promulgated to the world that I meant permanently to abjure office. I observe in the newspapers that Lord Goderich has invited me to join his Administration. I have not yet received the invitation, & I do not expect it; but if it comes, it will be easily answered.

It would unquestionably be most desirable that our friend West[morland] should do as you mention; but I think he would make wry faces. . . .

*Ibid., Melville Castle, 21 August 1827. Private.*— . . . From what I wrote to you a few days ago, you will not be surprized that I perused the Duke's communications with regret; but on the other hand, it is impossible not to admit, that having placed his former resignation, solely & exclusively, on the ground of Canning's behavior to him, he would have found it very difficult to justify to the public at large his refusal now, & might have run the risk of seriously affecting his own station & character. His position however *must* be awkward & uncomfortable, at least during the session of Parliament, & I do not understand how he will be able to steer such a course as will not give the Government a handle against him, though I have no doubt that Ld. Goderich intends to act fairly & honestly towards him. Though not in the Cabinet, he will be more à portée now to know what is going forward in the interior, & perhaps may be able to do good in that respect. We shall see how the Whigs relish his re-appointment, I mean those *not* in office; it

cannot be beneficial to them, & may be injurious; at least they will think so. It is useless however to travel farther among such speculations; nous verrons. . . .

#### 89. William Holmes to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

6 September 1827.— . . . There was a Cabinet yesterday at which Herries & Grant<sup>1</sup> took their seats. No Whig attended but Wynne<sup>2</sup> (he is a Radical). Lord Palmerston was also absent. How Tierney or Wynne can remain in after their declarations on this day week I cannot imagine, but so it is.<sup>3</sup> The whole party has been dragged thro' the dirt, which will for ever stick to them. Do not believe one word of what you see in the Times. Lord Lansdown never tendered the seals of his office to the King,<sup>4</sup> but he did indeed make another attempt with respect to Lord Holland, which his Majesty instantly put a stop to, & said Lord Holland never could be a member of his Government.<sup>5</sup> My own opinion is that the Government will blow up on some point of Government or principle long before Parliament meets. The Portuguese, Greek, & army reduction measures afford a fine prospect of difference of opinion, & if the Tories will only take up a position on the neutral territory, & form a corps of observation without (in the first instance) going into decided opposition, they will soon overthrow these people. A regular Tory Opposition cannot be formed, because there is no leader. Peel, tho' able, honest & high-minded, is too selfish, too proud, & haughty in his manner to have a personal following, & he is disliked by the King. He lost himself very much in the last session by his constantly talking about himself & his criminal laws, & you may rely upon it, that whenever this Government drops, the Duke of Wellington will be sent for & not Peel. Lord Milton, Althorpe & Tavistock are quite furious & will go into decided opposition, & be assured many others of that stamp will do the same. . . .

#### 90. Earl Bathurst to Charles Arbuthnot.

16 September 1827. *Private*.—Having well lectured my wife for having written that what has passed shews that the King is determined not to return to the seceders, I now must beg of you to lecture yours for having written to the same effect to my daughter. The admitting this is playing the game of the Whigs, who are circulating this to cover their own defeat. Altho', therefore, it were true, we ought to deny it, as nothing would so effectually thin our numbers if this were generally believ'd, but I do not think that what has passed hitherto, proves it beyond what we must have been all prepared to expect, that the King would so far resent our resignation, which exposed

<sup>1</sup> Charles Grant, president of the board of trade

<sup>2</sup> Charles Wynn, the Grenvillite; president of the board of control. He was by no means a radical.

<sup>3</sup> They had threatened to resign if Herries was appointed chancellor of the exchequer.

<sup>4</sup> Holmes was misinformed

<sup>5</sup> The king really said that he might be brought in to the cabinet at some future date.

him to much embarrassment (we contend that it was his own fault) as not to be ready to go out of his way to bring us back the moment we appear'd willing to return. I confess I think he judged wisely for his own authority & ease in not making a general sweep on Mr Canning's death, & certainly shew'd great promptitude & judgement in at once appointing Lord Goderich his Minister. He also play'd his cards well in reducing the Whigs to the dilemma of submission or resignation by persisting in Herries's appointment : and if he persists in the law arrangements, particularly in that of Shadwell,<sup>1</sup> the Whigs will be lower'd in public estimation, unless we raise them by complaining of having been neglected.

The manufacture[r]s in this country are by all accounts so thriving that the Government will have no trouble with them ; but I expect that Spring Rice<sup>2</sup> will give occasion for good opposition work in their Irish affairs, and as for our foreign concerns, it may be doubtful whether even the enterprising spirit of Mr Canning, which embarked us in them, could have overcome the difficulties ; but the weakness of the present Government will so lower us in estimation in foreign Courts, that the concerns must end discreditably. There is but one man of ability in the Cabinet, who is Huskisson. He is a democrat at heart, a projector from disposition, and anything from principle. He is much too shrewd a man not to understand how desirable it is for him, particularly in his official communications, to be well with the Commander-in-Chief (unless it should be a measure to be otherwise), but if they persist in their intention of reducing the army to the extent talked of, it may become a serious question with the Duke whether he ought not to do something more decisive than protesting against it. Even Lord Grey told me that a great reduction at the present moment would be impolitic, & you may be quite sure that it goes much against the King's wishes. They seem, however, hitherto to have neglected the Duke ; & the King's conduct in this particular, after all the advances made to the Duke, is very extraordinary, but all this, I know you are aware, had better not be talked of at present ; and tho' we may among ourselves admit that this, more than anything else, shews that the King is not favourably disposed towards us, we must not admit publicly that his Majesty has shewn any indisposition towards his old servants.

#### 91. Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Drayton Manor, 17 September 1827.*— . . . With respect to the Duke of Wellington, my own opinion remains unchanged, that he could not without loss of character have refused the offer which was made to him—but at the same time I much doubt whether he will be able, having accepted the command, to stir a step in opposition to the King's Government. I do not mean that he will be bound to support it on every question indiscriminately—on questions for instance totally unconnected with his office. But can he, being the highest military authority in the country and *holding the highest military office*, speak

<sup>1</sup> He became vice-chancellor of England in October.

<sup>2</sup> Whig under-secretary of state for home affairs.

and vote against the measures of the Administration on a question of foreign policy involving military considerations? I doubt it. This must be borne in mind; supposing the King to be jealous of the Duke, supposing the Administration to be not very well affected to him—the Canningites desirous of retaliating upon him his hostility to Canning—depend upon it that they would be glad to find a pretext for depriving him of the Command if they could safely do it. By safely I mean if they had a good ground against the Duke.

My own impression is that the utmost that the Duke will be able to do will be to disconnect himself from politics and maintain a dignified independence. I thought this, when I gave him without hesitation my opinion that he was right in accepting the Command. I only wish in accepting it he had added distinctly, without the possibility of misconstruction, 'While I accept it, I acknowledge no obligation and reserve my right to act independently in politics' I doubt if he could have *practically* enforced that right to any considerable extent, still I would distinctly have asserted it. He did so by implication, so that there is after all no great difference.

## 92. Sir Henry Hardinge to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

17 November [1827]. *Private*.—I have just seen one of Lord Hertford's members. He has been desired to vote in any way the Duke wishes—but Seymour,<sup>1</sup> I am told, has been desired to do the same, *unless the D. of W. accepts the office of Comdr. in Chief*.

## 93. Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Whitehall, 5 December [1827]*.— . . . Navarin[o] is a pretty business!! the very natural consequence, in spite of all Huskisson may say, of the conduct pursued at home. I have seen no one since I came to town—no one that knows anything. There appears certainly a very general feeling, not of distrust merely, but of contempt for the Government. Everybody says it cannot last, but nobody seems to know exactly why.

There are two strong reasons for its lasting—the common interest of the very inferior men who compose it, and the convenience of the King. I can readily believe that Brookes's Club influences the course of the Ministers—the Club and the newspapers—so it must always be when the country is governed as it now is, not by the heads but by the tails of parties.

I distrust all that is said to you by Herries—except so far as it is confirmed by other circumstances. As he has waded up to his chin through the widest part of *the Rubicon*, he is naturally ashamed of himself. That we should have lived to see the day—when instead of mending the blunders in the Malt Bill, he, *Herries*, backed by *Tierney*, is giving peace to Europe by resisting the invasion of Moldavia and Wallachia!

<sup>1</sup> Henry Seymour (1805–59), Lord Hertford's second son, was M.P. for Taunton. Hertford returned eight members to the house of commons

What course will the Duke take as to Navarino? If there is any great mishap, the Government is quite ready I have no doubt to place it all to his account. Will the Government let Shaftesbury take his office in the Lords—or will they put forward Lord Auckland? If they do—I do fervently hope there is spirit enough in the Lords to defeat them.

#### 94. Lord Ashley to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*London, 7 December [1827].*—The Government has no resource left but implication of the Duke in this affair, & they hope to live for a time by accusing that great man of being the founder of our respected Treaty<sup>1</sup>—nobody is deceived; but many have been set right by my most positive argumentation, for by God's blessing, I enjoyed six hours of confidential talk with his Grace on this very subject.

I own now a *personal dislike* to every man in the Cabinet; because the baseness of this charge has gone beyond all Party license, and Ministers must stand convicted of treachery & falsehood. It is remarkable to hear the whispers of displeasure among all sides, & the glum faces of their best friends are signals of rejoicing. I dined yesterday with Ld. Wharncliffe; he has not a syllable in their favour, and seems to look upon affairs as requiring '*extreme unction*'.

*Do not mention names*—Chin Bailey, a great friend to many of the Administration, is unable to contain his wrath; he assured me that the Treaty was founded in silliness and executed in villainy; I have said enough and felt enough, but I find my powers cannot reach the noble brilliance of many others—Bailey added that he made several enquiries, & had found the whole country indignant—one Whig County member declared to him, that if Ministers proceeded, he would join in anything, in any vote of censure to disgrace the whole kit.

Sir E. Codrington must be brought to a Court Martial. I hear from good authority that the log books go to prove that, when *Lt. Fitzroy* was killed, the fireship had been **ALREADY BOARDED** and **TAKEN**. The despatches of Sir E. must therefore be classed under '*lie of the day*'.

Ministers storm at the D. of Clarence—such is the result of all Canning's political strokes! <sup>2</sup> a sacrifice of posterity for the glitter of a moment! infamous & despicable creature!

I ask in all the shops as I go—they are scorned, these Ministers, look at the papers; even the Chronicle dare not speak in their behalf; and may heaven defend me from such advocates as the Times! Naval men tell me that the odds were much in our favour, 'ten line of battle ships against three'! As for brigs & trumpery frigates, the engagement was that of twenty giants against a hundred babies. But God bless our sailors! they are always brave & patriotic, and perdition seize those unprincipled statesmen, who can throw

<sup>1</sup> The Treaty of 6 July 1827 being based on the Petersburg Protocol (4 April 1826), which was the outcome of Wellington's special mission to the tsar.

<sup>2</sup> Canning had put him at the head of the admiralty in April.

away thus calmly, the lives of these valuable fellows and the bulwarks of the country!

I am going to Hatfield this evening, I hope Peel will be there—he must lead us now or we are undone.

[P.S.] Lambton is to be made a peer—Ld. Wharnccliffe told me that *Sir M. Ridley* had said ‘Lambton thinks to bring in his brother for Durham, he might as well try to bring in his dog’.<sup>1</sup>—Don’t mention names.

I am told that the country Whigs do not relish being led by the secretary to ‘*quatre vingt neuf*’ Club.

#### 95. Sir Henry Hardinge to Charles Arbuthnot.

22 December [1827].—I have no news & am on the point of leaving town. A friend of Ld. Lansdowne, a young lawyer, called upon me yesterday, & said he had seen Ld. Lansdowne on Tuesday who had called upon him to invite him & his wife to Bowood at Christmas—that he told him it was impossible he could remain in under all the mortifications to which he & his party were exposed, & the young lawyer offered a bet that I should be in office before March. He was decidedly adverse to Navarino & the Greek interference.

I am going at 1 to Ld. Camden’s, Wildernesse, Sevenoaks, & on the 13th to Maresfield. Dawson<sup>2</sup> whilst in town will look after the Standard. Best regards to Mrs Arbuthnot.

#### 96. Lord Ashley to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*St. Giles*, 26 December [1827].—There is nothing abroad as to their intentions of ousting my Governor,<sup>3</sup> tho’ I believe their wish goes far beyond their power—we may hope that in case of the attempt Ld. Dudley’s ‘*d——d fellow*’ will defeat the Administration.

I have had many kind assurances from different persons who seem eager to try a passage of arms with his Majesty’s advisers. If the Cabinet acted by rule & measure, I should doubt their daring to stand an opposition in this business, but driven as they are by Brougham & Ld. Holland, & governing as they do, but from hour to hour, I cannot answer for the result of a sudden thought in the mind of one of these nondescripts.

But do you be active & lose no opportunity of haranguing—it is well to be in readiness.

Lord Goderich has outraged all patience—I wish I was with you to croak over the disgrace & danger of our country.

I know nothing of France’s policy—we cannot any longer believe that this Cabinet is better than one of which Peel might be the head. . . .

How good the Standard has been of late!

<sup>1</sup> William Russell became member for Durham County after Lambton had been called to the upper house as Baron Durham.

<sup>2</sup> Peel’s brother-in-law, and under-secretary of state for home affairs, 1822–7.

<sup>3</sup> His father, Lord Shaftesbury, chairman of committees in the house of lords.



## 97. Sir Henry Hardinge to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

12 *January* [1828].—What a glorious triumph for our glorious hero!<sup>1</sup> What a year! If he had remained *in* with Canning, he wd. have been degraded by the connexion—and now what an honorable wreath of civil honors encircle[s] his brow almost covering the laurels of his military glories. I shall turn optimist—for everything that has happened during the last eventful year has exceeded what his warmest friends & admirers could have expected—but then the Duke's good fortune is in this as in every other instance founded upon great sagacity, intuitive judgement, & the most incorruptible integrity.

What a picture has poor Lord Gooderich & his pitiful co-adjutors exhibited! One cannot speak of them without seeking for appropriate terms of reproach, & these to be just must be so strong that I should only imitate the coarse apostates in April last if I were to indulge my feelings of disgust. You will hear of what is passing from Mr A at Apsley Hse I therefore hasten to close my note for the post.

*Ibid.*, 15 [*January* 1828].— . . . I wrote to Holmes last night a strong letter which I think he will shew Ld. L[yndhurst] exposing what I had heard of the plot to mob him out of office.

The opinions of the D. acceptance of the Army are pretty generally *for* that step—I think we are right, & I had rather see a hero high-spirited than politic . . .<sup>2</sup>

## 98. The Marquess of Londonderry to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Belvoir Castle*, 17 *January* 1828.—The more I think of the incorporation of Huskisson & Co, the more I am dismay'd. Full well I know the eternal torment he was to my poor brother. Fod God's sake! let them beware. This Machiavelian parvenu was the primum mobile of all the Æolian system. Is the Duke to be converted to his theory? Or do they suppose at Apsley House that Huskisson is to give his tacit consent to the break-up of his own system? If he joins the Cabinet the dry rot is fix'd, and depend upon it the Duke will lose his most devoted friends. Let them in God's name beware. I know the difficulties are great, far different from campaigning. In military affairs there is a sort of recipe to guide, better or worse managed in able or unskillfull hands. But in civil arrangements where conciliation and prospective views as to strenght [*sic*] or weakness prevail, the task is Herculean. Let us, however, pray we may not have a repetition of Charles the second. Do not let friends be forgot & enemies retain'd & rewarded, for the consequences will be fearful. From all I hear I wish we were in jolly opposition again. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Wellington accepted the king's invitation to form a government on the 9th

<sup>2</sup> On the 25th the cabinet decided, in his absence, that he should resign his office of commander-in-chief.

## 99. Sir Henry Hardinge to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

18 January [1828].—You will have recd all the details of the new Cabinet from Mr. A. The few points I knew, I derived in a great degree from his confidence, & I preferred not writing rather than trust my pen to the difficult task of concealing or revealing. As the new Cabinet is now approved by the K. & the diff. members have been with the Duke, I may now write to my friends conscientiously adhering to my promises.

I agree with you in all you so justly say, as a matter of *feeling*—we have indeed allowed sad rogues & intriguers<sup>1</sup> to remain with us—but in *policy* & *judgement* there can be no doubt of the absolute *necessity* in the Lower Hse. of sacrificing honest indignation to the expediency of more talking strength.

Mr. A. has been of the greatest use to the D[uke]—he could not have done without him, & he has shown great judgement & integrity on matters which you will, I am convinced, concur that he has acted nobly towards his friend.

As you have the list I shall not risk the post further than to say, I consider the Duke's triumph secured—his manner conciliates everybody.

## 100. Charles Arbuthnot to William Huskisson.

*Somerset Place. Saturday, 19 January 1828. Confidential.*—I am very sorry not to have found you at home, & the more so as I fear I must leave London tomorrow for a day or two

I have brought, & I now inclose, a copy of Canning's memm. wch you desired me to make for you. That memorandum contains precisely the wishes & the meaning of the Duke of Wellington & of Peel, so that upon the subject of the Catholic question there is no difference of opinion, & consequently there cd. not by possibility be any difficulty.<sup>2</sup>

Something was said, I find, to the Duke with respect to the neutrality to be observed (relatively to the Catholic question) in the disposal of patronage & in the election of members of Parliament.<sup>3</sup> It must, I am sure, be obvious that no stipulation of this nature cd. be made. It wd. come to be enquired, not whether a man was fit to fill the office for wch. he was destined, but whether the preceding appointment had been Protestant or Catholic; & certainly I might say that those who know the Duke must be aware that the rectitude of his mind is for all connected with him the best security.

I told the Duke that I meant to call on you, & he begged me to mention that he had fixed Monday for going to Windsor when the exchange of seals &c. will be made.

It has annoyed the Duke most excessively to see a list of the Cabinet in the Morning Chronicle.<sup>4</sup> No communication whatever has been made to

<sup>1</sup> The Canningites.

<sup>2</sup> See *The formation of Canning's ministry*, No. 219

<sup>3</sup> Palmerston made this inquiry. See his letter to Huskisson (18 January)—Add. MS. 38754. (Huskisson Papers), fos. 152-7.

<sup>4</sup> See *W.N.D.*, iv. 212

Lord Melville of the office thought of for him, & this premature disclosure will to say the least of it—be exceedingly inconvenient.

The blame of this disclosure is not cast upon any one ; but certainly great facility in the work of re-union has arisen from the discretion observed at Apsley House.

#### 201. The Marquess of Londonderry to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

22 January 1828.—After the candid expressions in my last letter, & the dénouement that has been since unfolded, I should not have dar'd again to address you if I had not recieved your letter of today I may perhaps be more feelingly alive than another to the dark workings of secret intrigue—alas ! I see it even now in full operation, and the brave & noble soul is surrounded by cunning enemies, who hate him in their heart, while devoted friends are unheeded & forgotten.

I have not seen the Duke. I call'd as soon as I came to town, but I only last night recieved a communication from him of his list, with the observation that the arrangement perhaps was not exactly what I would have wish'd for, but that you could not form a Ministry as you do a dinner, or a party in the country. Some affectionate personal communication as to the expediency & necessity of the present tableau might have been soothing to a devoted friend, perhaps from my peculiar position, & from the ardor of my attachment I might have conceived myself entitled to it. But from all I learn, my name is an interdict from one quarter, & Canning's friends dare not submit to any countenance being ever again shewn to me.

Ld. Cleveland (I hear) preserves his Co. patronage<sup>1</sup> & gives his support,<sup>2</sup> and those friends who are not wanted because the strentgh [*sic*] is now so vast, are left to breathe their attachment to the desert air. God send the Duke's, or rather Peele's policy who (I am sure has been the cause of Huskisson's entrée) may carry the country through its difficulties<sup>3</sup> But how principles are to be reconcil'd, & Canning's foreign & domestick policy sacrificed & given up by his devoted friends, is what the publick are yet to learn. Everybody says, my dr. Mrs Arbuthnot, the Duke counts upon his friends, & now is the time to stand by him. Admitted, but shd. it not be reciprocal, that *he* should acquaint them they may count upon him. What is ambition, honors, office &c but the race for emulation, and unhappily Canning has introduced the system that men are no longer guided by great political party & principles, but everyone seeks his individual object, & provided he can hang out the peg, it is little observ'd by what means or by what sacrifice of consistency & nice honor.

For myself, my dr. Mrs A., in defiance of royal friendship, in defiance of royal wishes, I have ever adher'd to those principles of policy & system of

<sup>1</sup> Durham.

<sup>2</sup> He joined the tory party in 1830. In 1827 Lord Darlington (as he then was) returned seven members to the house of commons.

<sup>3</sup> For Peel's views, see his *Memoirs*, i. 14.

Govt. in which my poor brother taught me to move. In his room I took another idol<sup>1</sup>—and in my humble efforts I sought to obtain confidence and consideration. Fate may decree otherwise—my hopes may be blasted, but I trust no one shall ever have fair & just cause to condemn me. To tell you we are all happy would be deceiving you. Too much strength may be weakness, household troops being dispersed may be dangerous, even to that illustrious hand which can wield any object with any troops, however motley, ill-assorted, & at present indescribable.<sup>2</sup>

### 102. Lord Ashley to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

25 *January* [1828].—The Duke and I had an interview this morning, very friendly & short—he told me his intentions were to put me in some situation where I should be the principal man of my department in the H. of Commons, & so it would [be] necessary to make a speech now and then. I am most grateful to him for this proof of his kindness & good opinion—there is nothing I desire more than to serve his Government, and for nothing perhaps am I less qualified—but it is my duty to make the attempt, and if I fall, I fall in no ignoble cause.

His object is to give me the senior commissionership at the India Board & thereby make me manager of these affairs in the Commons, as Ld. Melville will be in the Lords. It is almost cowardly to be so diffident, but were it not for the D. of Wellington, I should not dare, I think, to try so much.

Perhaps I shall not get this—there is a slight difficulty—I should prefer it greatly to a Lordship at the Admiralty, but many have made, of late, sacrifices of inclination, & I must do so too. Whatever may be the office, I shall endeavour to make myself as decent an underling as any other. . . .<sup>3</sup>

### 103. Sir Henry Hardinge to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

26 *January* [1828]— . . . I have no doubt the general amnesty is right—I have never entered into the family feeling agt. Mr. Planta—because I never could learn that he had done or said things of his gt. benefactor Ld. L[ondonderry]<sup>4</sup> which have been attributed to him—on the contrary I have been from a sense of justice on friendly terms—but you must recollect yr. own idea of the confidential situation he fills. I say this, that you may not harbour the notion that I am, as you term it, *hard* upon Mr. Planta. That he must be faithful to the Duke is evident—for I should say Brougham or

<sup>1</sup> The duke

<sup>2</sup> Sir Henry Hardinge wrote to Mrs. Arbuthnot on the 24th: 'Lord L[ondonderry] is not in good spirits—the Duke's forbearance is great, but Planta his confidential secretary, c'est un peu fort!!! Lord L. will feel this so bitterly that I have avoided the subject. Someone has inflamed him by stories against Planta when Canning's under-secretary which are too bad to believe, and which originated in the unavoidable succession of his services to Canning at Lord Londonderry's death'

<sup>3</sup> He was appointed a member of the board of control (*W.N.D.*, iv. 228)

<sup>4</sup> Castlereagh.

any man of intrigue wd., after so noble an instance of forbearance & confidence <sup>1</sup> as the Duke has given. In every new situation in which he is placed the resources of his mind are equal to the tryal

The great problem is in everybody's mouth what is to be done with the Army. Our friends say there is nothing unconstitutional, but hope he will give it up.<sup>2</sup> The Whigs are working upon those passages of C—g's letter to the Duke which touch upon this point. Ld. Howard <sup>3</sup> is an indiscreet babler, & if I had the opportunity I should give a hint that the repetitions of '*too bad*' from that office wd. not be tolerated a second time.<sup>4</sup>

They now say Lady Canning's fury agt. Huskisson was in the shape of a written message to Mrs Huskisson—that it was *purposely* lost & is now in circulation at Brookes's &c.—so Lord Durham told me.<sup>5</sup> I am in the worry of going down to an election, which I detest <sup>6</sup>—& I really think if it were not for the cowardice of desertion, that I should prefer my *demi-soldé* & a jolly opposition. Ld. Beresford <sup>7</sup> is my master, & I am not particularly reconciled in his person to the loss of the Duke. Howr. let us win the triumph, & I little care for the rest. . . .

#### 104. Lord Francis Leveson-Gower to Charles Arbuthnot.

26 January 1828.—I am truly obliged to you for the concern which you express in your letter on the subject of my affairs. I think it as well to let yourself & the Duke, in strict confidence, know more clearly than I could the other day how matters stand. I have long felt the necessity of coming to some decisive measure with regard to my seat in Parlt., & have felt for two years that the occurrence which has just happened could not ultimately be avoided. It was quite impossible for me to put what talents or parliameny. means I had, at the entire disposal of my father,<sup>8</sup> with whom all discussion of any difference of opinion was impossible. I found him in a state of great agitation on the subject of politics, & could not but agree with him that considering himself as attached to Mr. Huskisson's policy, he could not pledge himself to support a new Govt. till he knew how far Mr. Huskisson had protected that policy by the terms on which he had joined it. I found him much irritated at the total state of ignorance in which Mr. Huskisson had left him & all his friends on this point, & I must repeat that in this I could not but concur with him. These, however, were all obstacles which time might possibly remove, but the course of my father's further observations convinced me that there existed, particularly with regard to the Duke himself, such a difference of feeling that the time which I had always anticipated was arrived

<sup>1</sup> See my article, *The last of the Canningites* (E.H.R., Oct. 1935, p. 641)

<sup>2</sup> See No. 97 n.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Howard de Walden, who remained under-secretary for foreign affairs

<sup>4</sup> See *The formation of Canning's ministry*, p. 281.

<sup>5</sup> For Lady Canning's attitude see E.H.R., Oct. 1935, p. 645.

<sup>6</sup> He was re-elected for Durham City after his appointment as clerk of the ordnance.

<sup>7</sup> Appointed master-general of the ordnance.

<sup>8</sup> The marquess of Stafford, who was a Canningite.

at, which it was necessary for me to retire from Parlt. I do not in my conscience believe that if I could remain in it, I should find any occasion of difference with my father as to *measures* for years to come, but I cannot do so on the principle that whenever that difference occurs I am to give up my own opinion without *discussion or defence*, both of which in the state of my father's health are *impossible*. I would not on such terms give up the theory of gravitation to Sir Isaac Newton. I have therefore requested my father to find a successor for my seat, & shall retire from public life without any foolish regret at quitting so miserable & demoralizing a *métier* as politicks, but with a full sense of the consequences which at such a time of my life & such a period of events must be final to my political career, & I cannot expect that any future combination of circumstances can enable me to reach those who will now pass me in the race. I have committed my father as well as myself in what I have said of his opinions & the causes of our difference, I am sure that the Duke & yourself will feel how strictly confidential such a communication must be. With regard to the Duke my father sees many objections to his being Prime Minister, & at this point I am directly at issue with him, as I consider the Duke as imperatively called upon by the exigencies of the country & its interests to take the helm. It is on this point that a difference has occurred, productive of my resignation of my seat which could not, in the state of politicks, I am sure, have been long delayed. I hope to see you soon.<sup>1</sup>

#### 105. Lord Ashley to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Friday evening* [1 February 1828].—The writ was moved for this evening, and I cannot contain my joy in surveying the prospect of my future life: there is but one drawback to my satisfaction—if I had but a fair hope of discharging the duties of that office in a way to confer honour upon myself, and any benefit, however slight, to the Party, I should have no wish remaining but to thank the Duke for having put me in a situation so instructive and so useful—I love and respect him from the bottom of my soul, and if ‘I ever forget him, may my right hand forget her cunning’!

There is a point about which I have been very anxious to have a few words with you. Bear in mind the country wherein, by God's blessing, we live; its high moral character, and its curious scrutiny into the actions of those who aspire to rule it. Remember that it often ascribes to intention that which is simply an oversight, and quotes the great as misleading the petty, and then punishing them for faults of which they themselves set the example. Now after all this, here is the point! Should the *Duke* as *Prime Minister* of this country, held to be, and *proved* to be the honestest man in

<sup>1</sup> Lord Francis, who was M.P. for Sutherlandshire, and whom Canning had appointed a lord of the treasury in April 1827, now accepted Huskisson's offer of the under-secretaryship of state for war and the colonies after his father had withdrawn his veto on its acceptance (see *E H R*, Oct. 1935 [*The last of the Canningites*], p. 643, and *W.N.D.*, iv. 221).

it ; should the Duke be a member of that hell of all hells, Crockford's magazine of wickedness ? I have heard many lament that his high name is given to support so infernal an establishment—I lament it most sincerely myself, but less than others, because I know he was elected without any knowledge of it, and then gave his consent without the slightest reflection. The Press will soon spread this election abroad ; all England looks with disgust on that gambling house, and, I own fairly, that loathing as I do, the whole concern, where the fiercest vice is made splendid and fashionable, I do not see how a syllable can be urged in defence of such high patronage. The country, I am convinced, will not regard this as a matter of indifference, from Sutherland to Penzance there is one cry of horror that the laws can endure so gross violation of British feeling.

Not fifty Commissionerships and fifty speeches of unrivalled eloquence granted to me by some mystic power could make up for one word of this tendency uttered against that great man ; you will, I am sure, agree with me—try by hints or indeed by straightforward declaration to draw his name from the lists of that Club—it is better, I believe, to be straightforward with really great men ; of whom he is the greatest.

#### 106. The Marquess of Londonderry to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Holderness H[ou]se, 7 June 1828.*—I feel very grateful, my dr. Mrs A., for the very friendly, nay affectionate visit I had this morning. I know I am mainly to attribute this agreeable circumstance to your mention of our conversation of yesterday. Do not think meanly or ungenerously of me, in thus op'ning my mind to you. My position is difficult & requires all my exertion & energy to get through it ; and if I don't stand up for myself now, who is there, alas ! (since my fatal loss <sup>1</sup>) from whom I can look for aid ? Believe me, being pass'd over <sup>2</sup> by one's best & most powerfull friend entails not only personal mortification, but it depreciates the estimation in which one is held in the world, & where friends do not uphold, enemies become more vindictive. If the D[uke] has one friend in the world, who has ever been devotedly loyal to him, if he has one who has done more last year to shew it than myself, I would be ashamed to make any appeal, but when all but me, civil & military friends, have been noticed, it is undervaluing myself if I did not feel the disappointment.

You said one thing, however, my dr. Mrs A., in your conversation of yesterday, which in your partiality for an efficient instrument in the H. of Commons for the Govt., made you rather forget a much older friend, for surely former recollections entitle me to that claim. You said it was a great pity Sir H. H[arding] ever sat for my borough. But pray what would he have been, or how would he ever have got into Parliament but by Lady L[ondonderry]'s interest ? The ladder may be kick'd away when you have reach'd

<sup>1</sup> Of his half-brother, Castlereagh.

<sup>2</sup> Upon the reconstruction of the government after the retirement of Huskisson and his friends at the end of May.

the summit—but the ladder is necessary. Sir H. & the D., settled the business at Council, & my acquiescence was an after piece. It is true, they both felt perfectly sure I shd. yield, because I hope in God it never will enter my nature to desert a friend. But still the cavalier treatment gives the impression that Sir H. can manage me & mine, when really he cannot be my first & legitimate object. I hardly think there is a man living who, placed as I have been, would not feel it. Sir Hy.'s offer of raising money to pay his own elections is as absurd as preposterous, because if a borough seat gives political importance, who would allow that (by the payment of the occupant) to be render'd independent of the patron's controul? Forgive me for boring you with all this, but I cannot endure you, as an old friend, should think me ungenerous or unjust, or that you should not know, however I am us'd, my fealty, like my heart, where it is pledg'd, can never be chang'd or withdrawn.<sup>1</sup>

#### 107. Charles Arbuthnot to his wife.

*Woodford, Sunday, 13 July 1828.*— . . . I must settle some course of regular study for the summer. I will strive my utmost to *emerge* from the background in wch. I am, for it does annoy me, I own. It would be very unkind & unfair to be angry with the Duke, for in point of fact it is my own fault. Had I exerted myself in Parlt. I shd. not have been so left behind by others; but tho' it is my own fault, it does not the less mortify me. The office I hold is all that cd. be most honourable<sup>2</sup>; but indeed it is very painful to me never to be consulted, & never to be *mixed up* in everything, as I used to be. To this moment I have no conception how the Russian question stands. Whether I can *emerge* or not is the question I fear that the effort at my age is beyond human power, but I will make the attempt; & if I fail, I shall still have to be grateful to God for the greater by far blessing of possessing the best of wives & the best of children. As I shall not be wanted in the H. of Cs. I shall stay till Wednesday; but I dare say I must set out on Wednesday by 4 in the morning. . .

I cannot tell you how amused I am with the King not choosing to be approached by Lowther on money matters.

#### 108. Earl Bathurst to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Cirencester, 15 August 1828. Private.*— . . . I have always been persuaded that Peel would not come into an [*sic*] scheme respecting the Catholics, not, however, from his having any strong Protestant feelings.<sup>3</sup> He has long been strangely ashamed of the question, and of the eager Protestants, but

<sup>1</sup> Hardinge was re-elected for Durham City after his appointment as secretary at war in place of Palmerston.

<sup>2</sup> When the ministry was reconstructed at the end of May Arbuthnot became chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster (without a seat in the cabinet), and Lord Lowther succeeded him as first commissioner of woods and forests.

<sup>3</sup> At the beginning of the month Wellington had decided that the state of Ireland was such as to make Catholic emancipation necessary.



he dreads the charge of inconsistency, & is not insensible to the advantage of being consider'd as the head of the Church party, particularly if the carrying the question should not restore tranquillity to Ireland. From what one hears, however, I doubt whether he will ever be a good head of a party. He is undoubtedly the first man in the H. of Commons, and his influence, back'd by a good character & a large fortune, must always be very considerable; but he seems to want that cordiality of manner, & that elevation of mind, one of which wins the affections, & the other commands the respect, of a popular assembly; and without one of these qualities no man can long be a formidable leader in the House of Commons. His resignation, however, will upset the Duke unless he can call in foreign aid, & I am by no means sure that even that would do. But I do not think that the Duke could meet Parliament with credit to himself without having anything to propose with regard to Ireland: and Peel would object, even if the Duke were willing to consent to it, to a strong measure against the Catholics. I am quite clear that the Duke must go on & die game. Believe me, however, he is much mistaken if he thinks that he is really well at Windsor.<sup>1</sup>

*Ibid.*, Cirencester, 19 August 1828.—I went over to Cheltenham yesterday & met the Duke in the street. He said he was coming over to dinner here. Having, therefore, remain'd two hours at Cheltenham, one of which we spent in walking about, & the other he spent in the bath, we came over together. He dined here & return'd at night. . . .

We thought he look'd thin but very well, much improv'd in looks by his holidays & in very good spirits. I had a long conversation with him both on foreign & domestic politics. He is much pleas'd with what has hitherto passed with the King about Ireland, where, by the bye, Dawson (Peel's brother-in-law) seems to have made a speech which, coming from him, will occasion much surmise.<sup>2</sup> I believe the Duke did not know of it yesterday.

I have no *private* reason for thinking that the Duke's favor with the King is in reality slender. He is, I think, too indifferent about the Duke of Clarence remaining, which I cannot help suspecting might now be managed, as he has shaken hands with Cockburn.<sup>3</sup>

### 109. Viscount Duncannon to Charles Arbuthnot.

Mallow, 30 August [1828]. *Private*.—I promised to write to you after I had been a short time in this country, and as I have now seen a good many people of different sorts, I cannot do better than give you my own opinion.

<sup>1</sup> See, on this point, *Bathurst papers*, p. 656 (Arbuthnot to Bathurst, 17 August).

<sup>2</sup> Speaking at Londonderry on the 12th, he declared that the peace of Ireland depended not upon the king's government but upon the dictation of the Catholic Association, and plainly intimated that if a rebellion was to be avoided the Catholic claims would have to be conceded.

<sup>3</sup> The Duke of Clarence had involved himself in a quarrel with his council over their respective jurisdictions, and on the 11th the king accepted his resignation of the office of lord high admiral. Sir George Cockburn was a member of the council.

You must make the usual allowances for prejudice and partiality,<sup>1</sup> altho' I intend to divest myself of both. I begin then by saying that all you hear in England of rebellions and attempts at risings are totally false, and that these reports are spread for the worst purposes, that of raising a feeling in England against Ireland. I must, however, say that a great alteration has taken place here, and that every day increases the difficulty, and consequently the danger of Ireland. The Catholics feel and know their power, but to preserve it an excitement must be kept up, and this is the excuse we must make for all the violent speeches in the Association. The representation at present affords the means of that excitement, but in a short time a new subject must be found, and I am much mistaken if the tythe will not be the subject. You would say that was impossible, so you would have said before the Waterford election about the representation.<sup>2</sup> Be assured of what I say. There is the means of their giving incalculable trouble about tithe, and the time is not far distant when it will be attempted. Whatever you may hear, the union among all the Catholics, moderate as well as violent, is complete. They may differ on other subjects, but on this they are united, to stand together in furtherance of their claims, and I am positive whoever tells you otherwise is either deceived himself or wishes to deceive. What then is the remedy? I should say such a Bill, *giving emancipation*, as would satisfy the moderate [Catholics] and those Protestants who support them, and would at once detach them from those whose views are more violent, but whose power consists in the united support of all Catholics to get rid of a grievance, and in which view they are now supported by all reasonable Protestants in the south of Ireland. I may be mistaken, but I really think a large majority of the Catholics would thankfully receive such a Bill, taking it for granted, seats in Parl. are the foundation. What is then the alternative?—that you determine to postpone this measure, that you leave the Catholics (not to rebel, for they are much too wise) but to counteract by every means in their power the measures of Government—encourage a population to resist tithe, not to enlist in your army & navy, to return every member for every county, and to make a whole people disloyal. You may possibly force them to rebellion, and then, after much bloodshed and spending a profusion of money, you will still find them asking for emancipation and as little governable as at present. The misfortune is that in England the Catholics are judged of by the public speeches in the Association, and no excuse is made for the situation in which that body is placed. If they are not violent they will lose the controul in Ireland; if they are so, they are accused of injuring their cause in England. Violent however they must be till this question is set at rest. It is impossible that all should be quite satisfied, but I know that many of them, who would be considered most difficult to please, would be satisfied with a reasonable and fair measure. What I wish you and your friends to ascertain is the *real*

<sup>1</sup> He was the opposition chief whig

<sup>2</sup> At the general election in 1826 the ultra-tory Lord George Beresford, whose family had been all-powerful politically in the county of Waterford, was defeated by the Catholic Association's candidate.

situation of this country, and not to take it from interested deceivers. Lord Anglesey <sup>1</sup> is making himself popular by travelling about the country, and has everywhere been well received. . . .

#### 110. Sir Henry Hardinge to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Muddiford, Christchurch, 3 September [1828]. Private.*—I find from Lowther & Holmes who accompanied him *here*, that everything in yr. late departt. was found in excellent order—& Mr. Turner a great favorite.

I have been in town for the last fortnight going thro' the details of the office, & shall return *permanently* on the 14th.

Dawson's prank is a stale subject <sup>2</sup>—but a more extraordinary piece of indiscretion never was committed—& coming from a Treasury Secy. has given an appearance to the intentions of the Ministry as if they were ready to concede everything in a fright—whilst as a Catholic I cannot but feel after the Clare election <sup>3</sup> that strong measures of precaution & security are more than ever necessary to accompany anything in the shape of emancipation. If the Association are masters of the representation, which in the late instance they have strongly proved they are, I never will give a vote for assisting their entrance into the Hse. of Coms.—for if a Catholic body of agitators can return say 50 members of obscure connections, who would be bound to obey the instructions of the Catholic body, & come down every day at night-fall to vote agt. the Govt., I have seen enough of the Hse. of Coms. to know that no Govt. could stand, Whig or Tory, agt. such a combination in the Hse. &c., and if any of the Dawsons of Louth <sup>4</sup> are bullied into the concession of unconditional opposition to the present Govt. until emancipation be carried, *we* Catholics in a *large body* must declare our determination to vote agt. the Catholics, until the system be relinquished.

Coll. Wood, in a letter recd. this morning, says the Lord H[igh] A[dmiral] desired him to let it be distinctly known, that notwithstanding all that had passed, he remained affectly. attached to the K., retaining the same good opinion as before of his Govt.—that he should give it his support—that he was determined to steer clear of party, & not permit himself to be made a tool of by the Whigs—& that he was fully convinced the D. of W. was the only person at this time who could conduct the affairs of the country. Notwithstanding his reconciliation with Cockburn, he maintains he, Sir G. C[ockburn], had a convn. with the D. of W. *previous* to the writing of his *first* letter to the D. of C. in the *first* person—& again harks back upon Cockburn, having for a week or 10 days made Croker <sup>5</sup> his *bête noire*, who by the bye is in great alarm at the idea of his returning to the Admiralty. . . .

<sup>1</sup> The lord-lieutenant

<sup>2</sup> See No 108A.

<sup>3</sup> When the Catholic 40s. freeholders revolted against the pro-Catholic Fitzgerald family, defeating Vesey Fitzgerald, the newly-appointed president of the board of trade, and electing O'Connell himself

<sup>4</sup> Alexander Dawson was M.P. for Louth County.

<sup>5</sup> The secretary to the admiralty.

### III. Charles Arbuthnot to Lord Cowley.

*Woodford, 22 November 1828. Private.*—I am sure there is nothing more to be avoided than the fault I have committed in not writing to you immediately after I heard from you on the formation of the Duke's Government. The greater the intimacy is, the more difficult it is to write when once delay has arisen; for there is unwillingness to send a commonplace sort of letter, & one waits, & goes on waiting, with the hope that something may occur of sufficient importance to make a letter interesting. It is in this way alone that I can account for my having heard from you twice, yr. last letter a long time ago, & my not having yet written to you at all. I am ashamed of my silence. It must not be attributed to diminution of anxious interest about you, for disregarding of you as I have appeared, I can most truly say that you are ever occurring to my mind, & that if I had the means of being useful you wd. not find me wanting.

As soon as I recd. your last letter I went to the Duke, & spoke to him about yr. eldest son.<sup>1</sup> He at once said that the taking care of yr. son's interests had not escaped him, & that if he delayed getting him promoted it was not owing to want of thought or inattention, but to the necessity he felt of not pressing the Foreign Office too much at once. The Duke is now with me here, & before he goes away I will mention yr. son to him again. In short, you may rest assured that the Duke will take care of him, & that I shall not be deficient in giving him reminders shd. they be wanting.

After we all went out last year it was quite out of the question my attempting to communicate with you. I shd. have thought it unsafe to write anything worth your reading; & indeed I wd. rather have corresponded with you by the common post than thro' the Foreign Office. When at last the King had no course to pursue but to make the Duke his Minister, I really did not well know what to say to you. Many had doubts whether the taking Canning's friends was wise or not. I knew that the Duke was so circumstanced as at the time to have in fact no option left to him; & having reunited himself with that party, he was determined to act with them most cordially & fairly. It was very soon evident that the reunion on their part had been hollow & insincere, & that they were still in combination as a separate party, always on the look out to thwart the Duke, & ready to overthrow him if the means existed. It was therefore most fortunate for him that Huskisson (in his eagerness to be courted & to be intreated to remain) overshot his mark, & not taking the Duke's character into his calculations, that he committed the fatal blunder of offering his resignation.

From that time to this the Government has been conducted with the most perfect harmony; & I shd. say that at this moment the Duke is as firm in his position, & as strong in the country's good opinion, as any Minister that ever existed.

I need not tell you what efforts he has made to save us, in our foreign politics, from all the errors of Canning's measures. He has, as you know better

<sup>1</sup> He had been appointed an attaché at Vienna in 1824.

than I do, entirely regained the confidence of the Court where you are ; & he has succeeded completely in establishing the best understanding with France.

Having written thus far I was called away by the Duke, who wanted to speak to me. The subject was full in my mind, & I asked him what he could do for your son. He replied that he had spoken to Lord Aberdeen about him, & that he had been assured the very earliest moment shd. be seized for attending to yr. wishes. I can add to this that not only Ld. Aberdeen is most trustworthy, but that his devotion to the Duke (as he often lets me know) is enthusiastic & unbounded. Depend upon it therefore that all you can wish will be done.

We have here at home but one overwhelming question. It is that wch. regards the Irish Catholics. How this is to be solved, no man breathing can say. I look with confidence to the Duke upon this subject as upon all others ; & if it be not doomed by Providence that Ireland is to be the stumbling block of the British Empire, we shall have tranquillity restored by the Duke, & that country will become part of our strength instead of our weakness as at present. Next session will be a tremendous one I have no doubt. As yet the Whigs have not arranged themselves into an organised Opposition ; but they have been making efforts, as yet without avail, to persuade Lord Grey to put himself again at their head. The Canning party is the one which is now the most disposed to be actively at work. They say (& I know they do) that the Duke is in a cleft stick—that if he does not settle the Catholic question, he will be overturned by the H. of Commons—that if on the contrary he does attempt to settle it, he will be abandoned by the Tories—& that they will be then able to dictate their own terms, & to come in with the Whigs or without them as may at the time suit them best.

This is their language. It is dictated by mortification & bitterness, & without being a prophet I wd. venture to say that they will be as much mistaken now, as Canning himself was when he & his friends imagined that Perceval was to fall before them.<sup>1</sup>

There is however one among them who, if I mistake not, is little disposed to act with the Whigs. It is Huskisson. He wd. hereafter act with them if nothing better shd. offer itself ; but he has not forgotten that the Whigs wd. not support him when his breach with the Duke occurred ; & from language wch. he held to me, before he went abroad, he wd. be rather disposed to unshackle himself from his Canning associates, & throwing them over, get back to us if he could.

I have summarily given you the best idea I could of the present state of things here. The Duke has inherited more difficulties than ever a new Government had to encounter before—but unaffected by any personal anxiety to remain myself in office, & looking calmly at the posture of affairs, I do in my conscience believe that the Duke's Government is as stable as for the good of the country I most earnestly hope it is. But you may be assured that upon him alone the whole depends ; that in him exclusively the public con-

<sup>1</sup> In October 1809.

fidence is placed; & that were it not for him, the means at this moment do not exist of having a strong Government. Thank God his health is greatly improved. He has been a long time recovering from that dreadful mismanagement of his ear, the sad effects of which are not yet wholly removed; but it is astonishing to see with what facility he gets thro' all his labour, & so little does he spare himself that he executes everything thro' & by himself. . . .

## 112. R. Wilmot Horton to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

Rome, 6 December 1828.— . . . I am excessively angry at part of your letter, not with you, because I wish you to write out, nor even with your sposo whose phrase you quote, but with the opinion which is not founded. You say, or he says, that I made a '*mauvais calcul*' in not taking office under the Duke; that assertion, taking in the common sense, *means* that I calculated that his Government would not stand. Now I beg to say that I had no such opinion, but the *contrary*, & I will *venture* to add, that that opinion was not formed upon the merit of the Duke's Government, but upon the effect which I felt convinced had been produced upon public opinion, by the blunders & 'contretemps' which had attended other parties & other combinations. Again, to go to Ireland had been for many years the special object of my ambition. I *admit* that in advancing the opinions which I had done upon the Catholic question, & upon the causes & remedy of Irish pauperism, I made a '*mauvais calcul*' as to the means of attaining my object—but when that truth presented itself to me, I had gone too far to retract, & was much more *taken* with my own opinions & speculations, than with *any* situation which could await me—and I beg to say, I adhere to them now as strong *as ever*, & no consideration shall induce me to abandon them, being *proof* against the most stringent temptation to give them up—that is the *ridicule* if not the *contempt* of those who have shorter roads to their object than those of speculation & enquiry. I write this in no cynical mood, I am in perfect good humour with the world, and what is more satisfactory, with myself, & *incredulous* as he, who presides over 'Woods & Forests' may be,<sup>1</sup> I repeat, that if a dissolution were to take place, I would not move one step, or spend one farthing to accomplish my re-election at Newcastle<sup>2</sup>; if you will make me Minister at Naples, I will be extremely obliged to you, but if you won't settle that disgraceful Catholic question, at which all Europe is LAUGHING, I will beg leave to give a good vote or two against the Govt. before I set out to the south. You may remember that I told you that Lord Ellenborough, who has long done me the honor to cut me, told me at Paris *in 1821*, that the only way for a man to obtain *important office* was to make himself feared & hated by a Government by an annoying & vexatious system of opposition. I, on the contrary, good, easy fool, maintained that the true way was to work hard at details, & to serve a Govt. sedulously & zealously. I perfectly admit

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps Wilmot Horton was overlooking the fact that Arbuthnot was no longer first commissioner of woods and forests (No 107 n).

<sup>2</sup> Staffordshire

that the success of these experiments must depend upon the relative *operators*, but still with all due allowance, I have not the most distant doubt, that *his* principle was the *right* one. . . .<sup>1</sup>

### 113. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Fulbeck, 14 December 1828.*— . . . When I was in London Ld. Bingham called on me, but unluckily I was out. He gives a deplorable account of the Russian Army, both as to its losses & its conduct. The Russian Guards behaved very ill, I hear; & the army generally has suffered terribly in reputation. We hope that peace may be made this winter between the Turks & Russians, but I do not think that we have any good ground for this hope. The Russians have to regain their lost character; & the Turks are not disposed to concede.<sup>2</sup>

Here at home we are going on quietly enough. How it will be when Parliament meets I know not. The Duke has many gt difficulties to overcome, & the greatest of all is the Catholic question. I will not enter into surmises of what may happen; but the Duke's power seems to strengthen every day, & no Minister in my time ever gave such general satisfaction. You will hear of poor Ld. Liverpool's death. It was a most happy release. For his fame as a Minister it is to be lamented that he did not retire on Ld. Londonderry's death, for Canning turned him sadly to his own purposes. . . .

### 114. Earl Bathurst to Charles Arbuthnot.

*19 December 1828.*—I am very glad that the King has gratified the Duke by the manner in which he has given him the Lord Wardenship, & I think [he] will on many accounts enjoy the situation.<sup>3</sup>

I am afraid that you will find the removal of Lord Anglesey a heavier job than your knowledge of him & of his doings lead you to expect. He is more dexterous than is imagined, & tho' most see his humbug character he contrives to gain a great hold on the generality.<sup>4</sup>

There is, I hear, reason to believe that poor Liverpool did make some testamentary bequest to Lady Liverpool; but that after his illness he one day desired to burn some papers, & in his confusion swept, it is imagined, the paper into the fire. I should imagine that this must have been in [the] presence of Mr. Willmot, if it did happen. His hearse &c passed thro' this place two days ago. It made, I hear, a sad appearance, which is the case generally with these last journies, until they approach more immediately the place of interment. The hearse & coaches trotted off from the inn where

<sup>1</sup> For his political position at this time, see *The last of the Canningites* (E H R., Oct. 1935, pp. 653-5).

<sup>2</sup> The Russo-Turkish War of 1828-9 was concluded by the Treaty of Adrianople, 14 September 1829.

<sup>3</sup> See *George IV corresp.*, iii 448.

<sup>4</sup> Lord Anglesey was recalled for declaring himself in favour of an immediate Catholic Relief Bill, in a letter to Dr. Curtis, the titular Catholic primate of Ireland

they had baited, cover'd with white mud, amidst the shouts of a hundred boys who had collected on the occasion. On hearing of the hearse being in the town, I sent to offer the attendance of my carriage for the first mile, but the undertaker refused, as they were in an undress state.<sup>1</sup>

#### 115. Lord Francis Leveson-Gower <sup>2</sup> to Charles Arbuthnot.

3 January 1829.— . . . I have written to Mr. Peel all that it can be necessary for me to write on the subject of Ld. Anglesey's letter <sup>3</sup> to Dr. Curtis. You may imagine I was no party to that letter. I believe his object was to keep the Catholic quiet, but I differ from his judgement even as to this effect. For God's sake send some one here who can drive straight into the Castle & open his purse,<sup>4</sup> & if possible let him have a pretty daughter or other relation. The Duke knows this country well enough to know the difference between party popularity, & *Dublin popularity*. The last, which emanates from the poplin shops &c. is indispensable to a Ld. Lieutt., & more so than ever at this moment.

#### 116. William Holmes to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

Saturday, 17 January [1829].—I returned this day week from Stowe with Mr. Planta, & the moment I arrived I went to Mr Morris's house in Dover Street, who I found had gone down to Devonshire, & was not expected to return before this day. I went the next day to Brighton. . . . Whilst at Brighton a friend called to consult with me about a seat which was offer'd to him, & on referring to his letter I found Mr. Morris had also written to him. I therefore fear this fellow is likely to drive a hard bargain.

The day before yesterday Mr Knox, a son of Lord Northland's, informed me that his friend Col. Elphinstone <sup>5</sup> was a likely person to give up his seat for the present Parliament, & I requested him to write to him to ascertain whether he would or not. I know that he is desirous of selling the borough altogether. I do assure you that I never felt so anxious about any job in my life as I do about this, as it is the only opportunity you have afforded me of endeavoring to shew you that I am not ungrateful to either [you] or Mr. Arbuthnot, & I shall leave nothing undone to accomplish your wishes. Vesey Fitzgerald has not yet succeeded in procuring a seat. The only chance he has is Sandwich, whenever Sir Edward Owen shall vacate it, & I fear I shall have the trouble of canvassing the borough for him.<sup>6</sup>

I have not heard anything about who is to be our new Lord Lieut.—I

<sup>1</sup> See *Bathurst papers*, p. 657 (Arbuthnot to Bathurst, 16 December).

<sup>2</sup> Irish secretary since June 1828, when he succeeded William Lamb.

<sup>3</sup> *Annual register*, 1828, *Hist. of Europe*, p. 150 (23 December).

<sup>4</sup> The Duke of Northumberland, Anglesey's successor, was well able to do that.

<sup>5</sup> M.P. for East Loos. He did give up his seat, and Henry Thomas Hope was elected in May.

<sup>6</sup> Lieut-General Sir Henry Fane succeeded Sir Edward Owen as M.P. for Sandwich in March. Vesey Fitzgerald was brought in for Newport (Cornwall) in March



## 114 THE CORRESPONDENCE OF CHARLES ARBUTHNOT

hope either the Duke of Rutland or Northumberland. Lord Anglesey leaves Dublin on Monday next. I hear that Lord Francis Gower is conducting himself extremely well in his present very critical situation. . . . Lord Anglesey's letter is the subject of censure by all parties, & I understand that the manner in which he got the Duke's letter from Dr Curtis is quite discreditable to him. . . .<sup>1</sup>

### 117. The Duke of Rutland to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Brighton, 8 February 1829.*— . . . I need not tell you the high admiration which I have of the Duke of Wellington's principles and talents. There exists not a mind, the mechanism of which is more completely after my own heart's content. But I guess that even he would not say more in favour of the intended measure relating to the Catholicicks than that it is in his opinion the lesser of two great evils.

You have been aware of what was going on & intended for six months past, as you told me yourself. You have been able therefore by gradations to make up your mind to the necessity of the proposed measure. But I had no conception that such a measure was in contemplation, and that the state of affairs precluded the possibility of any other measure more consonant with a Protestant spirit until I arrived in London on Thursday night. Would you not then consider me guilty of rather too much laxity of conviction if I was at once, and without even knowing the details of the measures to be brought forward, profess my readiness to support that which I have always deprecated to the utmost extent of my power? I am wretched at having caused the Duke the trouble & loss of time which his long & most admirable letter<sup>2</sup> to me (written yesterday) must have occasioned to him. Had you told me he would have liked to see me I could have saved him from that trouble. I have been writing to him by this post,<sup>3</sup> and I have told him that I shall adopt no course hastily & inconsiderately—and this is a truth which I am quite ready to repeat to you. But in common with very many other zealous and solicitous Protestants, I am placed in a situation of great perplexity. I am quite certain that the greatest calamity which the country could experience would be the abandonment of his office by the Duke, for I know it would be impossible to expect any other than an exclusively Whig Government in that case, and the evils which I anticipate from Catholic concession, would be so much the greater, because the concession would be unaccompanied with those safeguards which will I trust be a feature of the measure now in contemplation.

### 118. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Whitehall Place, 20 February 1829.*— . . . You will know that we are embarked in the Catholic question. It creates a great storm; but until that

<sup>1</sup> See Dr. Curtis's explanation, *W.N.D.*, v. 413

<sup>2</sup> *W.N.D.*, v. 489.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 493

shall have been settled there was no chance of tranquillity for the Empire, & the Duke by universal consent was the only man to settle it. . . .<sup>1</sup>

### 119. The Duke of Rutland to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Belvoir Castle, 25 February 1829*—I know that a friend in need is a friend indeed, but no one ever wishes or expects their friend to make a sacrifice of conscientious feeling in their support. I am sure the Duke of W[ellington] & I perfectly understood each other when I left him on this day fortnight; and he went so far as to tell me that he did not *expect* my support till he had clearly shewn me the necessity of the measures he is about to introduce, nor did he desire me to do more than to postpone any pledge as to my conduct, till I had heard all their details. Fair madam, was not this what you yourself requested me to do, and am I not following this advice to its very letter? Pain I must experience any way; it will be most painful to me if I am conscientiously convinced of the existing necessity for the contemplated measures, and it will be painful to me to know and to feel that religious peace is only to be purchased in such a manner. You cannot have more confidence in the Duke than I have, nor a stronger admiration of him. I foresee we shall have great difficulties, I mean such persons as myself. This County is very hot, they want to petition the King & to do God knows what besides. I have a strong letter from Scarborough today, where the feeling is becoming rather intractable. I shall have need for all my coolness and discretion as well as firmness, & even now my path is not very smooth. Trench writes to me today in the following terms: 'I have had letters from Ireland today and I confess that every moment increases my doubts of the policy of resisting what cannot fail (if resistance be successful) to throw us into the power of the ultra Whigs, and of absolute unconditional surrender without the shadow of a security.'

What funny people you are in London to invent such curious new modes of treatment of the marriage vow, as Ld. & Ly. Clare have done! I now ask every lady whether she is going to unmarry? I asked this question immediately after the 'How d'you do' to Lady Southampton on her arrival here yesterday for a week. Do you know her? . . . We are a tolerable large party here, and yesterday were 30 at the dinner table. Tonight we shall occupy the new saloon for the first time since it was graced by your presence. Count Matuszewitz<sup>2</sup> comes here tomorrow. I am more eager to have him for a guest after what you have told me of him. But I hear from all quarters that he is particularly sharp & clever, & on dit that most of the Russian State Papers have been penned by him for the last five years. I will try and

<sup>1</sup> Lord Ashley, indeed, seems to have been one of the few politicians who thought that some other prime minister should, and could, have settled the question (Hodder's *Shaftesbury*, 1. 86). He himself had always opposed Catholic emancipation, but he voted for the Relief Bill and did not resign his office.

<sup>2</sup> Nesselrode's first secretary in the Russian foreign office. He was sent to London ostensibly to assist Prince Lieven, the Russian ambassador, in conducting the negotiations arising out of the Russo-Turkish war.

make to him the insinuations you suggest on the two points mentioned in your letter, but on one of them I shall have some difficulty not to affront.

I do not know Lady Clare; surely she is far from good looking. I am not therefore surprised at *his* snatching at her proposal to unmarried. Arthur Paget was lately at Middleton, when a lady with no good looks to boast of went from thence to meet her husband at night at some inn on the road to London; & no sooner was her back turned, than as usual, she was discussed in various ways by those whom she left behind. One said she was ugly, another did not think her as clever as she had been represented; a third said she could never please him with such a foot, if she has been in other respects a Venus (it was not I, I assure you) & at last Lady J[ersey] said to Sir Arthur who had sat silent, 'Well, & what is your opinion of Lady——?' 'Why, my lady,' he answered in his gruff way, 'I was just thinking that I am d——d glad it is not my duty to meet her, and to sleep with her tonight.' I suppose Ld. Clare is now hugging himself with some thought allied to the above feeling. . . .

## 120. Sir Henry Hardinge to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Friday, [19 June 1829].*—We adjourn till Monday, & then prorogue—the *fish* dinner is fixed for the 27th. Castlereagh's writ will be moved on Monday—a popular appointment<sup>1</sup> in every quarter except that in which it ought to be the most so.<sup>2</sup>

The on dit is, that the Canning Party & the low Whigs will unite—Palmerston to be the Leader in our Hse. & Ld. Lansdowne in the Upper. This party will open their ranks to the discontented of all parties. It would, if true, keep the high Whigs disunited from the Mountain,<sup>3</sup> & assist our union with our old Tory party, who are in the same humour as before, Ld. Falmouth having done & said everything in his power against the Bankes. There was something not very highblood in resigning & re-accepting immediately<sup>4</sup>—however Palmerston must look sharp, for the University in a general election say they will not tolerate *two* Whigs.<sup>5</sup>

The King has expressed his surprize at the disunited state of parties—he knows very well how essentially he must assist this state of things by having Ld. Carlisle, Morpeth &c. at the Cottage, whilst none of his Ministers were invited.

<sup>1</sup> Lord Londonderry's eldest son, M.P. for Downshire, was appointed a lord of the admiralty.

<sup>2</sup> Londonderry was still out of humour with the duke, who had not recognised his claims to a Cabinet office.

<sup>3</sup> The Radicals.

<sup>4</sup> George Bankes, M.P. for Corfe Castle, was re-elected on 2 July after resigning his seat. He was secretary to the board of control, but, though he voted against the Catholic Relief Bill, he did not resign his office.

<sup>5</sup> The Whig William Cavendish was elected for Cambridge University in June, *vice* Sir Nicholas Tindal, who had been appointed chief justice of the common pleas. Palmerston was the other member.

The D. of Cumberland <sup>1</sup> [is] as violent as ever, hoping by holding out to force the D[uke] to terms.

A capital anniversary—the D. in great spirits, & everything as it ought to be to celebrate that immortal day, & its glorious hero.

### 121. Earl Stanhope to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Vienna, 11 July 1829.*— . . . I avail myself of the opportunity which is offered by a courier being sent to England to renew my earnest & urgent request that you would have the goodness to recommend to the favorable consideration of Lord Aberdeen the case of our friend,<sup>2</sup> & I ardently hope that the result may realize our wishes. The kind interest which you manifested in this business, & the zeal with which you endeavoured to forward his application, convince me that the delay which has taken place has not originated with yourself, & I flatter myself that Lord Aberdeen did not feel any objections to a measure in which, as I understood, the Duke had expressed his acquiescence. I know not however what view the former may have taken of the subject, nor whether the sum of secret service money which may have been voted by Parliament was fixed with reference to this object, but in case that any difficulties should have arisen with respect to the amount of that fund I would suggest that a portion of the sum required, such for instance as £1,000, should be paid for immediate relief till the remainder can be supplied. As soon as Lord Aberdeen testifies his approbation, for which I have waited with the utmost anxiety, an application may forthwith be made through Lord Cowley, whose recommendation will no doubt have the weight to which it is justly entitled from his public & private character, & from his official situation. I need not on this occasion repeat the various grounds upon which, when I had the pleasure of seeing you, I pressed this application on behalf of a friend to whom I am most warmly attached, & to whom both England & Europe owe obligations which it would be difficult to requite. His long & eminent services, the intrepidity, energy & talent with which he constantly defended the good cause & the interests of England, even under circumstances of great danger & alarm, are indeed superior to all praise, & the situation in which he is now placed gives to him the means & opportunity which he is always willing to employ of rendering invaluable assistance. Those services have been well known & acknowledged by the Duke, & I fervently trust that they will now receive the consideration which is due to them. Allow me again to assure you that a compliance with his request will contribute as much to my satisfaction as it can to his own, & will confer the greatest obligation on one who is with great esteem & regard, [etc].

P.S. Since I wrote the above I have conversed upon the subject with our friend, who feels very strongly the extreme importance, of which you

<sup>1</sup> The leader of the opposition Tories, the Brunswickers, who had not forgiven Wellington for giving way on the Catholic question.

<sup>2</sup> Gentz, Metternich's friend and adviser. He took money from all and sundry. See C. S. B. Buckland, *Gentz and the British government, 1809-1812*.

will, I am persuaded, be fully aware, that the business should be conducted in such a manner as would not commit him, but would be strictly private & confidential, & might not require the intervention of Lord Cowley, which for several reasons he is very anxious to avoid, & which appears superfluous if Lord Aberdeen approves of the proposition. If I can be of any service in this business during my residence here, which will, I expect, extend to the middle of September, I shall be happy to render myself useful. Our friend is so much impressed.

## 122. Friedrich von Gentz to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Vienna, 12 July 1829.*—Lord Stanhope, qui connaît à fond ma position actuelle, et qui a bien voulu se charger de plaider ma cause auprès de vous, on a rendu compte de l'accueil plein de bienveillance, que vous avez fait à mes sollicitations. Cet accueil m'a rappelé tant de preuves d'une amitié aussi honorable que touchant, dont vous m'avez comblé, Monsieur, dans une des époques les plus intéressantes de ma vie. Vous savez que dans une carrière de plus de trente ans, j'ai consacré tous les moyens que Dieu a pu mettre à ma disposition, aux grands intérêts que la main puissante du gouvernement anglais a toujours glorieusement protégé, et que je ne cessera de défendre contre les nombreux dangers qui les menacent. Au milieu des changemens qui se sont opérés autour de nous, mes principes, mes sentimens, mes efforts, sont restés invariables ; et vous retrouverez en moi, tant que je conserverai un souffle de vie et de forces, le dévouement et le zèle, auquel plus d'une fois vous avez bien voulu rendre justice.

Des circonstances, hors de mon pouvoir et de ma responsabilité, m'ont placé dans une situation d'embarras, et je puis bien dire, de détresse qui m'a forcé d'avoir recours à vos bontés. Lord Stanhope, vous aura dit, par quels motifs de discrétion je n'ai pas voulu m'adresser directement à Monseigneur le Duc de Wellington, quoique bien sûr des dispositions gracieuses, que ce grand homme a toujours manifestées à mon égard. Je sais que personne ne peut mieux que vous me servir d'interprète auprès de lui. Daignez, je vous en prie au nom de notre ancienne amitié, et de tant de souvenirs, qui ne se seront pas entièrement effacés dans votre âme, venir à mon secours dans un moment de difficulté extrême, où il n'y a que vous et vos nobles amis, qui puissent me soulever. Ce que vous ferez pour moi, ne sera pas mal employé ; ce n'est que par une reconnaissance stérile, c'est par des services réels, c'est par un dévouement actif et ses bornes, que je tacherai de mériter jusqu'à mon dernier soupir le titre de votre très humble, très obéissant, et très fidèle serviteur.

## 123. The Earl of Aberdeen to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Foreign Office, 29 July 1829. Private.*—I return Gentz's letter, but I really scarcely know what answer to make. The S[ecret] S[ervice] Fund is at present so heavily charged that I am almost afraid to place before Parliament any

increase. I certainly, however, think that it would not be ill bestowed in this case, and that Gentz has the means of being useful. I also believe that, *for a rogue*, he may be considered honest. I should like to speak to the Duke about it, before deciding; if he should be of opinion that the value of Gentz's services is likely to be such as to justify this payment of a considerable sum, I have no objection to take the responsibility of augmenting the Foreign Secret Service, although I would willingly avoid it if possible. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Foreign Office*, 4 August 1829. *Private*.—The Duke quite agrees with me in thinking that any advance of the kind proposed, should come from Lord Cowley. He is the person to whom the return is to be made. Probably he has already done as much in this way as is reasonable. The fact is, moreover, that we have no funds; the Foreign S[ecret] S[ervice] is full, and there is scarcely margin enough left for the bare contingencies of diplomatick service until the end of the year. The sum in question, it would really be impossible to charge, upon this fund. I have no objection to authorize Lord Cowley to pay £500 for the purpose in question, and to hold out hopes that the sum may be increased in future; but without giving any positive pledge. This is all which the state of the fund will enable me to do, and even this may bring me into a scrape.

#### 124. Lord Francis Leveson-Gower to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Bessborough*, 6 September 1829.—I am very much inclined to look upon Ashley's love adventure in the light you do. I was a great fool, none greater, in my early days in these things, but if I had lived to Ashley's age unmarried, I do not think I should have got into his present galère in the same headlong manner. She is undoubtedly however a very attractive person, & if he succeeds, as I think he will, unless the conspiracy of the brothers & the dandies prevent him, I hope he will find it turn out well. Ashley has always been more or less of an Ishmaelite in the fashionable world. He has shewn very distinctly the contempt which most men of study can feel more or less for the idler members of society, he has never condescended even to effleurer the Crockfordism of the age, & the consequence is that he can have but few friends among the usual entourage of Ly. Cowper, who I imagine has little taste for uncut jewels, but likes those which have taken a high polish from the attrition of society, from Luttrell & Montron down to Mr. private secy Greville<sup>1</sup> & his brother Charles. These are my sentiments on the present crisis at Panshanger. . . .<sup>2</sup>

#### 125. Lady Harriet Leveson-Gower to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Shannon*, *Monday night*, [14 September 1829].— . . . You really are very provoking about Ashley. It is but a year & [a] half ago that you were much coiffé with him & that you told me the Duke wished especially to bring him

<sup>1</sup> Wellington's private secretary.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Ashley married Lady Emily Cowper, daughter of the fifth Earl Cowper and of Emily, Lady Cowper (afterwards Lady Palmerston), in 1830.

& Ld. Francis forward. I told you *then* to be cautious how you went to work, & that you might perhaps be disappointed in him. You formed too great expectations from him & they *have* been disappointed. The reaction is now much stronger than it ought to be, & in your mortification at having been mistaken in the political character of the man, you have lost sight of many redeeming qualities, & are too ready to find fault with *all* that he does, rather dwelling upon his failures than trying to forget them. I daresay he is quite wrong about his India affairs, but I cannot agree that is making so egregious a fool of himself in his love affairs. What is there extraordinary or absurd in a man falling in a [*sic*] love with the prettiest & most fascinating girl in London? 'Tis true that 2 months ago he thought of marrying, for marrying sake, Ly. S. Jenkinson, but with *that* girl he was no more in love than I am, & therefore there is nothing wonderful in his falling in love with Ly. E. Cowper so soon after his non-success with the other. With Ly. E. he is desperately in love, & thank Heaven Ly. Cowper's politics do not & ought not to interfere in an affair with her daughter. You seem moreover to value his services in the public line so little that I do not imagine you wd. care much if he did no longer adhere to the Duke, & took to Mme. de Lieven. Politics & political animosities are bad enough in themselves, Heaven knows. I am glad Ashley is not at any rate fool enough to allow them to interfere in his private happiness. Really, you never lose an opportunity of saying something against Ashley, wh. is not right or kind. I like him excessively. I think he has a thousand excellent & valuable qualities & two or three failings, of which I think falling in love with Ly. E. Cowper's not one: on the contrary, a proof of great good taste. Having said all this in defence of Ashley I now must tell you that it is very disinterested, for I think in many respects this marriage, if it take place, is not unlikely to turn out ill, for obvious reasons, his character & that of her family being so different. Marriages are made in Heaven, they say, & I only hope this will turn out well.

There—I have vented myself now & I am much more comfortable. So take care how you abuse Ashley any more to me. I shall defend him to you as I wd. defend you if I heard anybody finding fault with all that you do; tho', by the bye, many people think that one does one's friends more harm than good by defending them. We are in the midst of a very pleasant tour & have been to Ld. Kingston's angular Irish house on the largest scale. . . .

## 126. Lord Francis Leveson-Gower to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Dublin, 27 October 1829.*—I suppose we shall all be condemned to political death for the murders in Tipperary, & that as usual all the atrocities of that strange country will be laid to the account of Emancipation. I know the advantage which such horrors give to people who maintain this argument, but it is a delusion. Mr. Goring is murdered for exacting the tithe of potato.<sup>1</sup> In all ranks of society except the lowest I believe that improvement which was anticipated is taking place. We are making a tremendous example in

<sup>1</sup> See *W.N.D.*, vi. 257 (there wrongly spelt Going).

Cork, but, be the Govt. what it may & its measures what they may, you will have considerable crime among the overcrowded population of this country during the winter. The currency is contracting, prices low, & the rent will be hard to raise. Tell me what you hear of us & think of us. Bad, I know, but I shall be glad to hear it. Ld. Strangford & Ld. Talbot are here; the latter behaves like a gentleman & abuses the D. of Cumberland like a pick-pocket. Are you a friend of the former? If you are not you may as well know that he is doing no good here giving out at the Kildare St. Club, *as I hear*, that he is sent on a special mission to overlook the Ld. Lieutt., that the D. of Wn. never stirs a step without sending to consult him, & other brilliant sallies of his talent for invention.

The Cork Special Commission is the only set off against the difficulties & annoyances which this accursed country sows in one's path every instant. It has been admirably as usual conducted by Doherty. I should have taken prussic acid if it had failed. However you need not think I am desponding, *as long as the Duke is satisfied* in the main. I think if I have time I will get the Protestant Lords Lortons, Clancartys &c. into good humour. . . . Pray tell me what you think of our situation, & whatever you hear of it remember that our crimes are part of a system which has subsisted since the English conquest & cannot be reversed in a day. The gentlemen of the north are behaving admirably well.

#### 127. Lord Cowley to Charles Arbuthnot.

Vienna, 8 November 1829.—I confess I was never more surprised than at reading that part of your letter which relates to Gentz, nor did I ever hear of a more impudent attempt to obtain money from the British Government without the knowledge of the person who could be alone capable of judging whether it ought to be given or not. You will, I am persuaded, agree with me in this opinion, when I inform you that Gentz has for more than five years been in the receipt from me of five hundred pounds a year. This will account to you for the anxiety of himself and his friend<sup>1</sup> to conceal this transaction from me.

During the period of Canning's administration when he and Metternich were upon such bad terms, and when Esterhazy did all he could to blow up the coals, the information I received from Gentz was certainly useful to me. Since that period I have been upon more confidential terms with Metternich & have consequently been less in want of Gentz, excepting indeed that I am often enabled to form a more correct judgement of the real opinions of the former, by what I hear from the latter. Gentz however is so corrupt, such a complete *panier percé*, so constantly in want of money, that there is too much reason to believe that he takes it to the right & left from anybody who will give it to him, and useful as he may be, & certainly is to Metternich as a writer (not as an adviser, for he is so governed by his interests & his prejudices that his judgement is worth nothing), I have often thought that the Austrian

<sup>1</sup> Lord Stanhope. See Nos. 121-3.



Government would be much more respectable, and much more respected, had he nothing to do with its Chief. He is, however, Metternich's confidential friend, and we must therefore try to keep well with him—but be assured that the only way of doing so with any advantage to ourselves, is by keeping him in a state of dependence, that is by not giving him too much money at once. If you give him fifteen hundred pounds at once, you will hear nothing of him until the money is expended. I know this by experience, & have had one or two explanations with him upon this point.

My opinion is decidedly, that he has done nothing to entitle him to this additional reward. In any case I would recommend that the thing should stand over until I go to England, which I hope to be able to do. Lord Stanhope is certainly not the proper channel for such applications, and I am much obliged to Ld. Aberdeen for having declined receiving this one unless conveyed through me. If you attend to Lord Stanhope upon such subjects, the next thing he will do will be to ask you to give a pension to the Director of one of the minor theatres here, with whom he was living in great intimacy, & whose theatre he frequented every night. I must say that considering the intimate footing upon which Lord Stanhope lived with me at Vienna, he ought not to have taken this step without consulting me.

As yet Gentz has not made any application to me, and of course I have not mentioned the subject to him. He will probably make another attempt to get the money through you or through Lord Stanhope or perhaps through some other channel, but I trust that Lord Aberdeen will abide by the answer he has already given.

[P.S.] Lady Cowley can tell you a great deal about Gentz if you choose to talk to her about him. Upon the whole I believe it would be better that you should not inform Lord Stanhope that I have made any objection to this grant to Gentz, but merely tell him that it cannot be given unless recommended by me. Whatever you tell him you may be certain will be written back to Gentz.

## 128. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Stratfieldsaye, 10 November 1829.*— . . . You will want to know how we are going on in politics. The Duke felt, you are aware, that Ireland could not be governed while the Catholic question was unsettled, for the government of the country was in the hands of the priests. That question therefore was settled. The consequence has been that all the violent ultra-Tories, under the influence of the D. of Cumberland, have become hostile to the Government, & I dare say that when Parliament meets we shall have a powerful combination of ultra-Tories, Canningites, & Whigs against us. But my firm belief is that we shall overcome all their efforts, & of this I shall not have the smallest doubt if the King behaves fairly to the D. of Wellington. As yet I must own to you in confidence that his conduct has been most unfair. He cordially agreed with the Duke to the Catholic measure, but the moment the Duke of Cumberland appeared, he joined him against us. There is, however, such a

strong feeling in the country for the Duke, & he has such a powerful party to support him, that I have little fear of the result.

There has been a good deal of distress both in the manufacturing & the agricultural interests, but everything in both branches is now mending; and the distress was never near so bad as the ultra-Tories endeavoured to represent it. My friend Germain is among the very worst of them, but he is a violent bigot against the Catholics, & neither he nor his brother have ever been in good humour with the D. of Wellington's Government. In one respect you will not be a favourer of the Duke. He is the most pacific Minister we ever had. He has done & is doing his utmost to keep us out of war; but the successes of the Russians, & their conduct, have made the preservation of peace very difficult. I am sure the country wd. not like to go to war for the vain attempt to save Turkey crumbling from her own feebleness into the dirt; but we must take care of our own interests, & these, you may be assured, the Duke will not fail to defend.

#### 129. The Earl of Aberdeen to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Foreign Office, 19 November 1829.*—I return Lord Cowley's letter. I think you will do quite right to give the answer which you propose to Count Nugent. I felt pretty certain of the reasons which induced Gentz not to make his application through Lord Cowley; but I suppose it will come through this channel at last. At all events, we should have had Lord Cowley much, and justly displeased, if we had attended to the application when made by any other person.

#### 130. Lord Francis Leveson-Gower to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Dublin, 26 December 1829.*—I am in a state bordering upon lunacy with the wearing details of my business here; if you think there is anything like madness in what I am going to consult you upon, put it down to that score & order Stultz to make me a straight waistcoat with fillagree buttons. My case is this. If Louth become vacant <sup>1</sup> Shiel & Bellew will contest the County. If Bellew prevail we may have the property of the County in some measure represented. If not it will be represented by a man of no property, & who, by the circumstances of his election, may be pledged to rather violent R.C. courses. He is however, I believe, anxious to come into Parlt. for the express purpose of wreaking vengeance on O'Connell for various enormities, & to that object I believe he would sacrifice much. The Duke of N[orthumberland] has a notion that it would be an advantage to the Govt. to have Shiel in Parlt. as a supporter of its measures, & would be ready to furnish him the money to buy a seat for the session if he could get one. This is entirely his own idea, but although he wishes to keep the whole transaction to himself, he would not consider himself justified in stirring in it unless he knew that

<sup>1</sup> It did not, but Shiel unsuccessfully stood for the county at the general election in 1830. See *W.N.D.*, vi. 12, 254.

it would not be disagreeable to the Duke of Wn. I simply do his pleasure in communicating the idea to you, & if you think it too romantic to submit to the Duke, put my letter in the fire & let me know. I need not say no human being but ourselves has an inkling of it. . . .

### 131. Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Whitehall, February 16 1830. Private.*—My answer to your letter <sup>1</sup> may be conveyed in one line: I concur in every word of it. I prevented Hardinge from presenting his estimates last night, in order that they might undergo reconsideration—and I saw Goulburn & Herries on Monday last on the more important subject of modified taxation.

There are three measures which, if we can effect, will bear us through, I mean ultimately—all opposition.

1st. The removal of all restrictions on the establishment by Charter of Banking Companies with limited responsibility.

2ndly. A *bonâ fide* reduction of expenditure—to the lowest amount consistent with the *public safety*.

3dly. A commutation of taxes bearing on the industry—and the comforts of the labouring poor—for other taxes reaching *Ireland—great capitalists and absentees*.

### 132. Mrs. Arbuthnot to Charles Arbuthnot.

*W[arwick] C[astle], Friday [5 March 1830].*— . . . I enclose a note for the Duke. I hope his colleagues won't plague him too much, for they won't like his abandoning them, & yet I see clearly his fixed project now is to quit at the end of the session. I have entreated him not to make any resolution of that kind, & pointed out to him that his work will not be complete, but if he takes this up as a fixed notion he may be obstinate. I shall set off as early as I can tomorrow & be in London by seven if I can. I have asked the Duke to come & see me in the evg. if he can. I shall be delighted to see you again, my dearest love. I had almost forgot about Ld. Chol[mondeley]'s marriage.<sup>2</sup> I don't think he cd. do better, and as it is a very well-behaved, good family, if *he is as poor Ld. Choly. used to say*, one has a good chance that a wife of that sort won't introduce any *left-handed child*. I think it a mercy he has not chosen some vulgar methodist. . . .

Lady Warwick was laughing with me today about *my love for you* in old times. I told her I had never repented & that if at the end of 16 years Henry <sup>3</sup> was as happy he wd. be a lucky fellow! . . .

<sup>1</sup> Add. MS. 40340 (Peel Papers), fo. 219 (16 February), urging the necessity of 'an entire revision of our system of taxation', and of further retrenchment of expenditure.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Cholmondeley, whose younger brother Henry married Arbuthnot's daughter Marcia, married, as his second wife, on 11 May, Lady Susan Somerset, fourth daughter of the sixth duke of Beaufort.

<sup>3</sup> Charles Arbuthnot's second son married Lady Charlotte Rachel Scott, daughter of the second earl of Clonmell, on 30 April 1830.

## 133. Lord Stuart de Rothesay to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

Paris, 10 April 1830.—I am very glad to see by your letter that you are not so much frightened at the reports which reach you respecting the state of things here, as many of our friends. The truth is that a very active correspondence goes over, which is, I believe, directed by the Flahauts,<sup>1</sup> & that Lady Holland, Lady Cowper, Mme. de Lieven & every enemy of our friends derive from that source a variety of reports for which nobody is responsible, & which are circulated ad libitum on the days which intervene between the departure of the regular couriers. They consequently either forestal and contradict the intelligence which I am enabled to send over, & which, though frequently scanty, is with few exceptions true. This party made no allowance for the determination of the King of France to support his Ministers in the face of an Opposition majority, & are consequently disappointed & furious at every measure which has resulted from this determination. He is now quite *tête monté*, & I am sure, *coute 'que coute*, will carry matters through.

Leopold is not in better odour here than in England, & though he has come to Paris for the purpose of raising money, will, if all the French Ministers say is to be trusted, go back no richer than he came. . . .<sup>2</sup>

## 134. Charles Arbuthnot to Lord Cowley.

Drayton House, 11 April 1830—I am always unwilling to lose a safe opportunity of writing to you, & I never dare write unless I have a safe one. I was very sorry to miss seeing Lady Cowley before I left London; & indeed from having been unwell at one time, & having at all other times my whole attention taken up with committees in the mornings, & the H. of Commons at night, I have been able to call upon her much less than I had wished. She has, however, written to me that she leaves England for Vienna on the 14th, & therefore I hasten to tell you all that I know.

You will have known from Lady Cowley's letters while she has been here, & also from the newspapers, the nature of our general proceedings. Before Parliament met I told you that the Duke had great difficulties to encounter, but that he would, I was confident, surmount them all: and this the result I think has proved.

Everything in this country is in the most extraordinary state possible. We met Parliament with the King notoriously & almost avowedly against us, the Duke of Cumberland & the Brunswickers resolved to go all lengths, even unto Radicalism, rather than not do their utmost to destroy us. The Canning Party outrageous against us, and hoping that by union with the other parties we might be overcome. The Whigs in general well disposed to

<sup>1</sup> The comte de Flahaut (1785-1870), afterwards Napoleon III's Ambassador at St James's, married Princess Charlotte's close friend Margaret, daughter of Admiral Lord Keith.

<sup>2</sup> Prince Leopold had accepted nomination as sovereign prince of the new Greek state, but in May he resigned his claims.

us, but impatient to be taken in, & apparently resolved to act with others unless they shd. perceive that they were to be conciliated. Our own Tory Party diminished in numbers by the secession of the Brunswickers, & forced on account of their constituents to unite in the general cry of distress; but otherwise as well & as heartily disposed towards the Duke as a set of men could be.

Such was the situation of affairs when this most laborious & most important session had to commence its work. In the House of Lords the Duke was better supported than we were in the Commons. He has done admirably well, & upon every occasion he has been triumphant. By degrees the King has become better disposed towards him & the Government; & I really believe that at this moment we are as safe in that quarter as we could desire. The Duke of Cumberland has damaged himself by the sad catastrophe of Lord Graves,<sup>1</sup> & I know that when he goes to Windsor he is a very unwelcome visitor.

In all this, there has been an immense change for the better in the last two or three months; & I am sure that this is the strong feeling & opinion of everyone.

In the H. of Commons Peel has had terrible difficulties to encounter. He has done a great deal better this session than he ever did before, & he has risen amazingly in public estimation. Upon all great occasions we have had large majorities; & although we have in one or two instances been defeated by a general combination against us, it has not had the effect of weakening the Govt. or of exciting the notion that we are in any danger. It can seldom happen that all the parties can unite against us; & even when they do, the measure we have to defend must be a very unpopular one if we cannot muster greater numbers than they can. I have no doubt you will learn from Lady Cowley that in the world the Duke's Government is now considered to be quite secure.

You will have been led to imagine from the papers, & also from the letters you may have received, that this country was in the greatest & most universal distress. My own conviction is that the cry of distress was first raised by the Brunswickers, who gladly seized what seemed to them the best means of bringing the Govt. into disrepute. We had had two bad harvests, & from this cause there certainly was a good deal of pressure upon the agricultural interest. I am, however, certain that this was partial, & will soon be found to be only temporary. Few, however, in the H. of Commons dare to avow this, for everyone seems to act as if a dissolution of Parlt. was expected; & as all tenants want to have their rents lowered, it would be most unpopular to declare that the distress had been exaggerated. But I am very sure that whether we look to the landed or to the manufacturing interest, we are in this country in a far greater state of prosperity than is the case in any other part of the world. I believe that when you come to England you will be astonished at the signs of wealth which you will see in every part of the

<sup>1</sup> He committed suicide in February, believing that his wife had been carrying on an intrigue with the duke of Cumberland. See *Geo. IV corresp.*, iii. 505.

Kingdom, & you will find that improvements, inventions & discoveries have gone far beyond what you could have contemplated. It is true that profits are very small, either in agriculture or in trade, but still there are profits; & unless we have very low prices we could not send our manufactures into foreign countries. I know that at Liverpool, at Manchester, at Leeds, & in all our great towns, trade has increased most enormously. Huskisson told me that the traffic between Manchester & Liverpool had increased to such an extent, that let the new railway take all that it was capable of conveying, still there would be more goods to go by the canal than was the case when the project of the railway was first suggested. I mention all this merely to let you know that we are not in so disastrous a state as you probably have been led to believe.

The Duke is certainly the most economical Minister that this country ever had. He has already effected great reductions, & he will effect a great deal more. He has also repealed taxes to a very large amount, & I have no doubt he will repeal in time many more.

I should say that the foreign concerns of the country have annoyed & worried the Duke more than anything else. He was forced against his will to act upon Canning's Treaty of July 1827, & this has involved us in many discussions from which the Duke would very gladly have been free. I hope that the settlement of Greece will put an end to that treaty. When I left London a few days ago, Prince Leopold was still making some difficulties, but I imagine that they will have been got over, & the sooner he goes to his sovereignty the better. He is a poor creature. I fear the selection has not been a fortunate one; & I expect that he will be entirely Russian.

I really am not aware of anything else to tell you at all interesting. When living on the spot there are daily occurrences about which one talks with eagerness, but which carry with them no lasting importance, & which therefore are immediately forgotten. Even what I have written to you is not of sufficient importance to give you the trouble of reading; but I have done my best to let you know how things actually are, & I believe that the account I have given you is a faithful one.

After the Easter recess our H. of Commons labours will be as fatiguing as they have been since Parliament met; & I never remember our sitting for so many hours together, & for night after night, as has been the case this session. Everybody is now a talker. There is but little of eloquence, & scarcely any promising young men; but everybody has a word to say, & no one, who has not been present, can have an idea of what fatigue it is to listen for weeks & weeks together to the very dullest of speeches.

I cannot express to you what sincere pleasure it will give me to see you again. I was very sorry when I found that you had given up yr. intention of coming home now, but if you come in the autumn & before Parl. meets, I shall be able to see you better & to enjoy yr. society more than when I am unceasingly obliged to attend the H. of Commons. You will find me very tired of public life. I have had enough of it to be permitted to be tired of it, & were it not that I shd. have reluctance in going out of office while the Duke

is at the head of the Government, I could not resist sacrificing income & everything else for tranquillity & retirement.

I do not expect to hear much from you while you are at Vienna I hope however that you will write to me when you send home a messr., & you may be very sure that whether I see you or not, or whether I hear from you or not, you have no friend on earth more attached to you than I am, or more truly & affecty. yrs.

### 135. The Marquess of Londonderry to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Holderness House, 22 May 1830.*—I must always be deeply pain'd when I excite the anger of one of your sex, & more especially of *one* who for so long was my friend. The consciousness that I have never deserv'd to lose one that I was proud to enrol in that *catégorie* must be my solace under all the mortification & annoyance of the present aera. I wish I could be of your opinion that political subjects do not entail differences in private life Alas! they are the bane of solid regard. Emily<sup>1</sup> behaved very ill in making mischief, & repeating to you my melancholy and disappointed *confidences* to her, made in moments of illness & possible ill humor. This tracasserie you yourself condemn, & yet it has operated against me. The stories that the malicious propagate are too numerous & are generally too successfull to make it necessary for one's own sister to repeat *tales*. I am to be pitied, & no one need shew warmth to me. My friends throw me off, considering me *not worth having*. Devoted as a friend, or bitter as an enemy, I feel I am not of a passive nature for those I love; I would sacrifice all I possess, & in weal or in woe, so long as they are kind to me I never could change. But that same warmth of nature makes me susceptible, & neglected and forgotten, & standing alone, bereft of all former intimacies. I know not where to find that good fortune is to which you so largely pointed my attention. The time may come when I shall get over all I have suffer'd, & all that has *made me so very ill*. Perhaps I have not felt it so much for my own person as for the *total oblivion of another*.<sup>2</sup> If he could look down & behold it, he would scarce believe it. But it is best to be silent & keep one's mortification to onesself, doing the best one can, for those who only care for one. Pray forgive me, for saying thus much. I should be very sorry you were ever so unhappy, as the person you deem the most fortunate of men has been this last year.

### 136. Sir Henry Hardinge<sup>3</sup> to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Sec. Lodge, September 2, 1830*—Many thanks for your recollection of me—I have been attempting to dive into the labyrinth of Irish business, & don't feel satisfied until I have made my acquaintance with the most prominent & important of the public questions which are likely to engage the attention

<sup>1</sup> Lady Hardinge.

<sup>2</sup> Castlereagh

<sup>3</sup> In July he had been appointed Irish secretary, Lord Francis Leveson-Gower having resigned and been appointed secretary at war.

of Parliament—but the Irish are an extraordinary people, & have more peculiarity of character than any I have yet mixed with in society. The day of my arrival was marked by troops marching to quell a riot 40 miles from Dublin, in which 4 or 5 Protestants in self-defence killed 5 Catholics, the latter on the following day, suddenly assembling & armed to the amount of 20,000 men. We are now making enquiry into the origin of the fray, & altho' the country is quieter than usual, nevertheless the outrages are by every morning's post shocking to the habits of an Englishman, altho' considered as matters of course here.

The facility of suddenly assembling without any ostensible leaders is the worse feature in these affairs—& in the particular instance to which I have alluded, I regret that the quarrel was one of a religious kind, merely because the conflicting parties were Protestants & Catholics. The Protestants are, except in the north, a mere handful of men in the midst of a dense population of Catholics. The gentlemen & magistrates evade doing their duty, & even avow that the fear of being molested, is the cause of their criminal inactivity—& no man dare assist a deserving & persecuted neighbour in distress from some fear of being marked out for vengeance. This selfish cowardice in the upper classes creates the danger of which they complain, & gives to the turbulent rascals the power which they possess.

I hope to be able to make an example of one or two gentlemen in this affair, & to compel the magistrates to bring the offenders to punishment, rewarding & protecting the oppressed. Whenever a farmer boldly defends his hse., I propose to give him some encouragement & reward. The constabulary work admirably, & if it were not for the jealousies of the magistrates about their petty jobbing patronage in naming the constables, I am persuaded we might make this important force much more available than it is.

I don't think the state of affairs in France has been felt by the people here <sup>1</sup>—the excitement of a general election, & the license which it allows, will acct. for much of the democratic language lately held. My opinion is decidedly against that held by many of our official people, that we shall have attempts made to terrify & coerce the Govt. on the subject of tithes &c. or of a separation from their connection with Gt. Bn. The people of property of all sects will be agt. such enterprises—the only fear is, that the gt. majority of the population are so wretched, & multiply so fast, that as they cannot be worse off than they now are, they may by any change be benefitted—but such attempts without leaders will be confined to partial disturbances, & if the demagogues are kept under, I think there is nothing to apprehend, but everything to hope that affairs here are gradually but surely improving. At all events the measure of last year was a piece of good fortune, which no sane man who looks to what is passing on the Continent can now wish undone.

With regard to our Administration, if anything is to be done, it surely ought to be attempted before we meet—we must not concede anything to fear at the last moment. Many may join us from fear who on a pinching

<sup>1</sup> The July Revolution had resulted in the deposition of Charles X and the succession of Louis Philippe.



question will desert us; & those who wish us ill will be emboldened by our condition to push us to an extremity. If we take Whigs & unite, we shall lose the unity of the Duke's Govt. altho' we may stem the progress of democracy by the enlistment of some of its most able advocates—but whatever is done in the way of change or accession of fresh members of the Cabinet, have no open questions. If Ld. Grey or Althorpe with other Ministers were to advocate reform from the Treasury Bench, the question wd. soon be carried—& reform & revolution are in my mind synonymous words . . .

### 137. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Childwall, 17 September 1830.*— . . . This fatal event is ever present to our eyes.<sup>1</sup> It is too dreadful to think of. We went yesterday in carriages to a place 14 miles off—we came to the railway. An engine was just passing. It was stopped. It was resolved to get into the machine, Mrs Arbuthnot being most eager for it, & I did not like to return in the carriage without her. I believe we went 14 miles in 40 minutes. I know we went part of the way at the rate of 30 miles an hour. I had in the morning promised myself never to go on a railway again. I will not again make such promises to myself, but I trust I never shall see one again. I am sure there will be numberless accidents till they get into the way of them. They will do wonders for trade. . . .

I really think that the cry about distress was perfectly wicked. In my life I never saw nor could have imagined such prosperity all over the Kingdom, & I have travelled immensely this year. They say that the dinner & Ball wd. have cost £10,000.

### 138. The Duke of Rutland to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Belvoir Castle, 21 September 1830.*— . . . You appear to be in good spirits, but I own I fear the character of the new House of Commons, & I expect to see questions of reform carried against the Government, which will shake the whole fabrick of our Constitution. I really believe, from all that I hear, that no man possesses a more splendid & magnificent interest than I have the pleasure of heading in this County. But there is a much more formidable interest than could be supposed among the Radicals & Dissenters, & I find that my conduct on the Catholick question has certainly so far alienated some of the ultra Tories as to have had an effect at the election. But a great interest is like a great army. It may exist but it cannot be set in motion without an enormous expense, and if there should be a *premeditated* contest on a future occasion, £50,000 would not more than cover the expense of the election. There was no canvass this last time, & by great good management on the part of my brother's committee the expenses will be within £6,000.<sup>2</sup> A

<sup>1</sup> Huskisson was killed on the 15th on the occasion of the official opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway by the prime minister.

<sup>2</sup> The general election necessitated by George IV's death on 26 June took place in July and August. Lord Robert Manners was returned for Leicestershire.

meeting took place last week at Leicester to congratulate the French on their revolution, & in the speeches the orators promised that in a short time 'there should not be a vestige of nobility in England unless the aristocracy mended their manners & sentiments,' & the whole meeting responded, 'the sooner it is done away with the better.' I almost think the Duke of Wellington ought to read the newspaper in which the speeches delivered at that meeting are recorded. They go farther than any that I remember even in the days of Horne Tooke &c. . . .

### 139. Sir Henry Hardinge to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Ph[œnix] Park, 22 September 1830.*—Many thanks for yr. note. In what strong contrast the good-feeling of the Duke at the moment of Huskisson's death, stands to Brougham's indifference & bad taste in going to the dinner. The contrast with some of his, Huskisson's, personal friends might be still stronger drawn.

He was a very agreeable, good-natured man, & on all subjects very plausible & clever. If he had joined or had not opposed the Govt., his views & measures wd. have been warped by a desire to please Liverpool at the expence of the State<sup>1</sup>—but his death appears to me to be important as dissolving his Party, & of obtaining individuals at a less cost; but if Palmerston is to join, I should say the measure ought, if it be practicable & desirable, to be accomplished quickly; & in these times a man should decidedly take his side, for it is very important to separate the aristocracy from the Whigs & Low Party. The revolution is apparently about to commence in France, & with our densely inhabited districts of manufacturers, we cannot hope to be free from French imitations. Belgium if adroitly managed promises a successful termination, & will be of immense value—for the separation wd. have led on the first favourable opportunity to an annexation with France, & a continental war. As it is, if the sovereignty of the people at Paris carries the day, war must take place with the continental powers even if we can keep ourselves out of it by the Duke's cool, steady judgement.

Here we are quiet, & not more ready for mischief than we generally have been for the last 30 years—but the population is increasing & with it pauperism, & a conviction that any change cannot be injurious to the thousands who exist by a daily miracle. But there are no leaders. The Catholics are quarrelling among themselves, as you will have seen by the late speeches on the Address to the French people.

The Liberals are outrageous with O'Gorman Mahon & Lawless. The former on some pretence called upon me & said he should support the D. agt. the libels of the Liberator O'Connel, & did so manfully at the meeting. In short, nothing could have terminated so well to convert the gt. meeting of the Irish people into a farce, & to throw disunion amongst the friends of liberty. I feel satisfied we are going on well—the D of N[orthumberland] has no jobs of his own—but is resolved to act impartially, & if the poorer classes

<sup>1</sup> Huskisson had been M.P. for Liverpool.

could be relieved from the squalid misery & want in which they barely exist, this country wd. shortly be quiet & happy.

As it is, the country is improving—my only dread is famine—the horror of putting down by force starving depredators, or of giving aid out of the public purse—howr. the potatoe crop is large & good, & I think we shall go on in spite of revolutions, without any addl. force, having this year sent 3000 men to England.

I like the office much better than the War Office. . . .

*Ibid.*, [16 November 1830]—The King has behaved admirably—ready to go on or not, & Peel, Ld. Bathurst &c. &c. have gone to H.M. to have *their say*, saying that it is impossible to go on, & that it is more advantageous to go out upon a question in support of the K. prerogative (not to have his List examd. in Comee.) than upon a more serious question.<sup>1</sup>

This is a mere question of chaff, showing a determination of the diff. parties in the Hse. to turn the Duke out—but I hear they intend to come to the Duke in a body, to *force* him to accept the Comd. of the Army. This in my opinion wd. ruin the Duke with Peel & the gt. Tory interests, who cannot be protected, if he is tongue-tied by office. If he is to save the country from revolution, he must be a free agent—he cannot with honor oppose bad measures whilst in high office under the Whigs. It wd. be equally improper in my view of his position to show a particle of the feeling of *faction*. He must stand by the Constitution as the *conservator* of the throne, the aristocracy & the country, & if he clogs his independence by mily. office, I am persuaded he will be less efficient to do good, & cause a great falling off of our friends by the hopelessness of a leader. Also let him avoid any pledge that he leaves office for ever &c. &c. &c.

In short he should not commit himself—but hold himself in poise, ready to resist the mischief which these men must attempt to perform, to redeem their pledges.

I hear they acknowledge the difficulties of their position. Ld. Lyndhurst talks of going out & will offer to resign, knowing that he will be pressed to stay in. . . .

#### 140. John Charles Herries to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Carlton Gardens*, 24 December [1830].—The attack upon the Pension List in the He. of Commons last night came somewhat by surprise upon us.<sup>2</sup> It appears that Guest sent some notice to Arbuthnot, but we knew nothing of his intention to mention any particular pension till we met in the House. The feeling of the House was not violent, & nothing personally unpleasant occurred. The Pension List is an unfavorable topic, & there are always willing

<sup>1</sup> On the 15th Sir Henry Parnell carried against the government a motion for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the civil list, by 233 v. 204. Preferring to avoid a defeat on the question of parliamentary reform, the Duke resigned on the 16th

<sup>2</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, third series, ii. 90–101.

hearers when any cases of cumulation of benefits from the Crown are exhibited invidiously. Of the few of our friends who were in the House, the majority urged the propriety of our not allowing the debate to close without some speech or declaration from our bench. I agreed in that opinion. Croker was violently opposed to it, & thought we had better not open our lips. I thought then, & I am now quite sure, that if we had permitted the strange & unconstitutional trash that was talked to pass unnoticed, & without noticing the improper silence of the Ministers of the Crown who had listened to it, we should have cut a very contemptible figure. But although there was this little difference as to the question of speaking at all, there [was] none as to the propriety of confining our speeches or observations to the general question of the *Pension List*, & the right & prerogatives of the Crown. We were all clearly of opinion that to enter into any arguments on the merits of any of the cases cited on that occasion would have been unfavorable not only to ourselves but to the cases thus brought into discussion. We were the more strongly of this opinion because nothing had passed to require any vindication of character, & that the House had shewn no ill temper in respect of the individuals whose names had been mentioned. For these reasons I made my speech an attack on the King's present Government for abandoning by their silence the cause of the Monarchy & the just rights & privileges of the Crown. It appears to have had a good effect in the House, and it produced a declaration from Graham in the name of his colleagues that they would uphold the Pension List on the principle of *non-interference* by the House of Commons in the distribution of pensions—saving always the expression of any opinion as to the amount which should be assigned to the Crown for that purpose. I think there is no reason to apprehend any attempt to cut off any of the pensions of the late Civil List. We avoided that topic because it was not pressed in the other side. But if it should ever be necessary to discuss it, as I think it will not, there are overwhelming arguments against the impolicy, as well [as] the injustice, of such an attempt. Upon the whole I saw no evil spirit in the House last night, beyond the cowardly desire of many of the members to curry favor with their constituents by manifestations of anti-corruption, as they are pleased to call it. Our views of the constitutional points of the subject were very generally cheered.

I have written this long account because I know you must be anxious to hear from me on this particular subject. I am glad to be able to give you what I consider as a satisfactory account. The Ministry looked dull & black. We hear today that there [are] symptoms of schism among them on the subject of Reform. Graham, it is said, urges more desperate courses than his colleagues are disposed to adopt.

#### 141. Sir Henry Hardinge to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Bolderwood*, 31 December 1830.— . . . I hear from Wales thro' the Wynn part of the Govt. that Ld. Grey is very sick of office, & desponding between the pledges of the party & the impracticability of redeeming a tenth part of

their promises. From other quarters, such as Sullivan, D.S. at War, there seems to be a feeling that the present arrangement cannot last, & the Palmerston party keep aloof from public observation as if cautiously reserving themselves for a change.

From the north a friend of mine, a Mr. Buddle, says the question of reform has made great way amongst the middling classes, & that the Duke of W. from being very popular has lost all favor for *the present* by his declaration. My boy's tutor writes from Oxford, that the Duke *was* very unpopular for the same reason, but that a reaction is gradually coming about. Basil Hall writes in ecstasy of the Duke's declaration & predicts a day of triumph. He is a clever fellow, but his feeling is of course biassed by his article in the Quarterly a few months before the coup d'état. Ld Londonderry, who is going to Belvoir, says that he shall support Ld. Grey if his reform is on the minimum scale, but not otherwise, & in the same breath asserts that the only real solid policy of the Duke's Govt. was his declaration agt. reform, & his reprobation of the example of Paris & Belgium. Lady Brownlow writes in high glee & admiration of the Duke—& Ly. Caroline Wood says the Duchess of Gloucester is outrageous at the manner in which the Ministers have encouraged the attacks upon the King's Civil List. I also hear that there will be no dissolution—and that the Govt. are frightened at the very thoughts of a Genl. election in Ireland.

There the vain Marquis has copied our Proclamation, applying it to prevent a meeting of Trades (the same which Ld W. Paget attempted to get up to welcome the new Ld. Lt. on his arrival) interfering with the liberty of the subject in a case not near so strong in justification as that which Ld. A. publicly disapproved of, viz., an association of Irish Volunteers to meet weekly at a Parliament office, to receive permanent subscriptions or rent, & to send delegates into any Co. of Ireland. He has even imitated my *impertinence* in sending O'Connel one of the *wet* Proclamations for his breakfast table. Mr. Crampton [? Crompton] writes that he saw Ld. A. riding about the day of the Proclamation in high spirits as if he had *veni, vidi, vici*—pardon a scrap of latin—but my belief is he knows nothing of the real state of Ireland: & I feel convinced that the state of that country is becoming every day more alarming—not attributable to any particular Govt. of the Viceroy of the day, altho' materially augmented by the follies of such a man as Ld. A., but really because the mass of the people, excited by their demagogues, are bent upon revolution & separation. The mob has not actually commenced hostilities, because they are told the moment has not arrived—but the people of property think the game up, knowing the disproportion between the mob & the troops, without daring to call in the aid of yeomanry. Our arrangements of precaution are even lauded by our successors—but when a Ld. Lt. tells the people, *agitate* & you will force us, the Govt., to concede what you desire—meet & pay rent & you shall not be put down—such a Govt., when it resorts to the means it has decried, is but a shadow—the real power rests with O'Connel & his party—his wicked excitement is exclaimed agt. by all parties & persuasions of property—but while alarm is general the apathy is extraordinary. We got up the *anti*-repeal

declarations in Octr. last, to compromise the people of property by their signatures as soon as we could—but Ld. A., out of favor with the mob, & suspected by the Orange party, has every party united agt. him, except the liberal party of property, represented by the Duke of Leinster. Latterly the smaller Protestant shopkeepers are, I hear, encouraging the mob—the feeling in Dublin is decidedly worse & Dublin being the capital is the place where the revolution, whenever it may be attempted, will originate. All our arrangements had for their chief object the preservation of the capital—& now that Ld. A. cannot ride into the Castle without being hissed, he will perhaps approve of the 10,000 rations of provisions, arms & amn. laid up in his palace, & which for the Man of the People he seemed to think superfluous when he alluded to these preparations before he left London.

I hear from Limerick there is no unusual distress—but a decided conviction that the peasantry to a man will rise & be all ready to obey O'C. summons. With a Govt. more unpopular than the last, & with an unhappy race, who have nothing to lose, but who are stimulated to believe any attempt must be successful agt. their English enemies, I cannot but consider Ireland, *under any Govt.*, in a state of gt. peril—but with the Duke of W. energies—his name, & the persuasion that he will vigorously go through what he undertakes, this country might be saved—& by exerting his influence & uniting the conflicting interests who have property, we might avoid the anarchy & ruin which are impending. . . .

#### 142. Charles Arbuthnot to his wife.

*Fawsley*,<sup>1</sup> 13 February 1831.— . . . I cannot say how pleased I am that that Jacobin Lord Althorp shd. be in so great a scrape. Is it possible they can go on? The sad thing is that as yet *we* are not standing well in the country. You know what a Tory Knightley is. He plainly owned to me that had he been in the House he shd. have supported the present Govt., & he told me that he had apologised to Ld. Althorp for not being at his election. The disturbed state of the country prevented him. He is, however, most vehement now against the Ministers, but he is dreading that their breaking down wd. give power to the Radicals, *so inveterate*, says he, *is the whole country against us*! These were his very words. I stifled my indignation but I wished myself away. He says that our refusing to consent to a moderate reform had stirred up the whole population against us; & that if these men are turned out, he feels that the country will be very loth to have us again. He had been sure, he says, for a long time that we could not stand, & the change had pleased him because he thought that these men wd. stand between us & the Radicals. By that he means that by them the country wd. be saved from the Radicals. What nonsense! But alas it is nonsense wch. has spread far & wide, & I thought I observed the same feeling at Drayton. Knightley, however, is now most hostile to the present men, but he don't know what to wish for. He clearly don't wish for us. He ridicules the idea of Ld.

<sup>1</sup> Sir Charles Knightley's seat in Northamptonshire.

Althorp's continuing Chancellor of the Exr. He says that nothing could equal Ld. Althorp's vanity at his election. He told the people that *we* might have done well in *quiet* times, but that we were not fit to govern England in times like these. He boasted also of ordering his door to be shut against Rothschild. He wd. have done well to take a page out of Rothschild's book, & he wd. not have brought forward such a Budget. I only fear that these blunders will make them desperate, & force them further into Radicalism.

I shd. like you to be quiet till the pensions are over—you are quoted whether you speak or do not speak—someone wrote that one night at Ld. Salisbury's you had said you wd. rather meet the devil at dinner than Lord Althorp. I dare say there is not a word of truth [in it]. I was sorry not to get the Albion. Here they take in the *Age* & other papers of the enemy wch. I cannot bring myself to look at. I earnestly hope that the ultra-Tories will come round. That alone can save the country. I think the D. of Buckm. may do great good. Your letters are the greatest comfort to me. I am impatient to get from hence. Sir C. is an excellent man, but he is the most silly politician I ever heard talk, & a blessing it is that he is not in Pt. He would never know his own mind 2 minutes together. I am disgusted with Ld. Douro. I suppose the end of the Budget will be very little change or remission of taxes, & what a mess they will have made of it. They will be sure to be driven out of the Wine duty.<sup>1</sup> I only hope & pray that the House will insist upon a greater surplus than £400,000. It is too provoking, but the rage in England for reform has certainly blinded all men's eyes, & prevents their seeing or acknowledging how wise and safe our finance system was. One cd. never have hoped that these men wd. so soon have shown how much *we* ought to be regretted. . . .

*Ibid.*, Woodford, Wednesday, 16 February 1831.— . . . I find that Mr. Poyntz is to succeed me. This is the way Ld. Clinton will give flattering unction to his soul for bringing in a Whig. Mr. Poyntz is his own near connection, but he is also the very near relation of Ld. Althorp.<sup>2</sup> While naming Ld. Althorp I must tell you that he *spoke of us* at his election as fit perhaps for quiet times, but not fit to govern the country in times like these.<sup>3</sup> He has written to a confidential friend at Northampton to take care that his constituents should not press him to favour ballot. At his election he went in a sort of triumphal car. There was an advertisement that an engraving of this car would be sold for seven shillings. It is sold for 2d!—all this was told me by Sir C. Knightley. Dalton also told me that the engraving wch. was to have cost 7 shillings can be had for twopence, if any one wants to buy it. I mention all these things together because I think they would do

<sup>1</sup> Althorp reduced the duty on French wine and raised that on other foreign wine and wine imported from the Cape.

<sup>2</sup> William Stephen Poyntz, who was returned for Ashburton in February, was the nephew of Georgiana, Lady Spencer, Lord Althorp's grandmother. Also, his daughter Elizabeth married Althorp's younger brother Frederick, afterwards fourth Earl Spencer.

<sup>3</sup> Althorp was re-elected for Northamptonshire in December 1830 after his appointment as chancellor of the exchequer.

well for John Bull, & it might be said that the failure of the Budget had brought the Ch: of the Exchequer so to discount that being formerly at a premium of seven shillings, he might now be had for two pence.

I cannot express to you the joy I have at their failure. Do tell the Duke that I am in ecstasy, & that I hope & trust it is the commencement of the revenge I am sighing for him to have. I ought to tell you that no one can abuse them more than Sir C. Knightley does, but I am sorry to say that he had expected great things from them, & that he was meaning to support them with all the influence he has; & in this county it is great. He is dreadfully afraid of the Radicals, & he had the folly to think that the Whigs cd. protect us against them. He is also impressed with the conviction that the country is inveterate against us, & he has this notion so strong that he is wondering who will govern the country when the Whigs are turned out. He seems to think that we are quite out of the question. The Catholic question I see is at the bottom of the whole. Lady Knightley burst forth last night against that vile *apostate* Philpott<sup>1</sup> as she was pleased to call him. There is no ill will but a vast deal of folly, in Knightley's mind. He extolled the Duke to the skies to me. I am dying to know what is to happen. Is it possible they can go on? You have never told me how the meeting was between the Duke & Peel. Have you seen Lady Peel? I am trying to reconcile myself to having ended my public career by redoubled interest in my farm, & by reading. I shd have cared for nothing if I cd. but have kept my seat, & as I know I was well with the people of Ashburton it sadly vexes me to be forced to retire. . . .

*Ibid.*, Woodford, 17 February 1831.—I am eager beyond all measure My only fear is that the detestable beasts are damaged too soon. That is, before the country has come round to us again. It is coming I have no doubt, for there is such an excitement against the present Ministers that there must be a good feeling again for the last. But I am quite sure from all I hear that the country was *very inveterate* against us. All the violent Protestants have done their utmost to damage us. The French Revolution set all mankind mad, and then be assured that the Duke's declaration against Reform,<sup>2</sup> tho' most honest, put the people in a phrenzy. There was a great anxiety to get rid of us. I am sure of it from what I heard at Fawsley, & Dalton has now owned to me that it *was* the general cry at all market towns. But our best friends have been our enemies. It is now, I am told, universally felt that the Whigs are not fit to govern the country. I only hope that the cry will come round for us, tho' I fear that as yet there is no cry for us, tho' a great cry against those who turned us out. I am rejoiced to hear that there was a meeting at the Duke's. I judge from this that Peel & he are hand in hand. I have feared not by yr. never answering my question how they were together [*sic*]. I judge from the Duke's telling Peel I was out of town that you have never seen Lady Peel. I was in hopes you would. If the Duke & Peel met

<sup>1</sup> Henry Phillpotts, bishop of Exeter, the anti-Catholic controversialist, who, however, supported the Catholic Relief Bill in 1829. He opposed the Reform Bill See No 163c.

<sup>2</sup> In the house of lords, 2 November 1830



together, & if the ultras are reconciled to us, the present men cannot last. I am sure Ld. Grey is getting in a passion by the manner in wch. he answered the D. of Buckm.<sup>1</sup>

People lose their temper when they are playing a losing game.

I don't think Mr. Praed's speech cd. have been well given.<sup>2</sup> H. Chol[mondeley] praised it to me, but said it was not perhaps well suited to a new member.

If I were ever so fond of London & of office I cd. not be more eager. I like those I have left in London, but alas I am sorry to say that the country is what suits me, & as for office I hate it. I wish I could have kept my seat for the great delight of taking part against the Whigs, who are the veriest blackguards that ever breathed. I abhor them. I wish you would make Croker get into John Bull what I wrote to you of Ld. Althorp.<sup>3</sup> Knightly told me that nothing cd. equal his vain glory, & his chattering against us. Could it not be put in that he must be one of those designated by Brougham as not capable of counting five on their fingers.<sup>4</sup> Nobody will buy his car for 2d, tho' advertised for 7 shillings. They are in a great fuss at Ashburton about my writ. Do make Herries name it to Lord Althorp. I wrote to you that Mr Poyntz is to succeed me, so you see that the Govt. has got the seat. If Herries don't speak, get J. Kirkland to write a formal note to Ld. Althorp informing him that I am out of town but that he for me has paid the fees at the Exr. for the Chiltern Hundreds, & that his Lordship may move the writ when he pleases. I verily believe I cd. come in for Ashburton whenever I pleased. Oh what a blessing it wd. be to me if my nerves had not been shattered. I wd. not be what I am. Once the pension question over, & there will be nothing to care about. . . .

*Pray* have Althorp quizzed in J. B. . . .

#### 143. Mrs. Arbuthnot to Charles Arbuthnot.

[P.M. 17 February 1831].— . . . I am quite as much annoyed as you can be at yr. going out of Parliament, but we must console ourselves with the 2000 a year. I have seen Holmes & Herries this morning, they say they will beat the Govt. out of all their taxes, & it is said they mean to make up for all deficiencies by 2 million Exchequer Bills, in short by a loan! This is perhaps only talk, but they certainly cannot carry cotton or wine. Ld. Chandos is endeavouring to get the West India body to coalesce with the Canadian & Cape interests, they are going to have a meeting some day to settle the affair. Since I began this letter I have had a scene which has annoyed me beyond measure. You know I told you the Duke was in a state of great annoyance about Douro, & I talked to Douro this morning, told him how wrong I thought him, how right it wd. be for him to make some submission to his father, & he said he wd. write to him & see him & try to

<sup>1</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, third series, ii. 467 (14 February). The duke criticised the proposed tax on the transfer of government stock and landed property.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, ii. 498 (14 February). A speech criticising Althorp's budget proposals.

<sup>3</sup> This, apparently, was not done.

<sup>4</sup> See *Parl. Deb.*, third series, i. 645.

get into his good graces. He acknowledged himself wrong, & certainly expressed the deepest vexation & distress at being ill thought of by him. The Duke called here soon after, & I told him what had passed (I had talked to Douro because he had wished me to do so), said that Douro wd. write to him, & said when he saw him I hoped he wd. settle the affair amicably with him, or something to that effect. He got into one of his most furious storms, abused his son, spoke as if he wished him to go out of his house, & then fell to abusing me, who, he said, always took part against him, & never did him justice, & used him shamefully. I was so astounded I said nothing I believe my silence made him more angry, & he snatched up his hat & was going out of the room. I caught hold of him by his coat, and he turned round. I said, 'How can you say such things, you must know I don't care the value of my pocket handkerchief about yr. son except for yr. sake.' I held it up as I spoke, he snatched it out of my hand, threw it upon the floor, swore a great oath, and rushed out of the room! I assure you he was like a madman, & if he had knocked me down I shd. not have been surprised. I was silly enough to sit down & cry, but since, it only makes me melancholy that he shd. give way to his temper so. You can't think how it has annoyed me. . . .

*Ibid.*, [Postmark, 18 February 1831] —I am quite provoked with myself for having been so silly as to tell you of my scene with the Duke, for I have caused you 24 hours of annoyance & wrath, whereas I have not had two. For as soon as he got home from the H. of Lords he wrote me the kindest possible note saying he was mad & begging my pardon, & saying it was only a proof how anxious he was for my good opinion. I was quite unhappy, for tho' I had been *furious*, still I cd. not bear to think that *he* shd. have to make *me* an apology. I wrote to him as kindly as I cd., so we shall be as good friends as ever again, & I hope he will not think any more about it. The truth is, he suffers from his son's conduct. He thinks he treats him infamously and he never speaks on the subject but with the greatest possible irritation.

I went last night to a child's fancy ball at Mrs. Compton's, Mr. [? Mrs] Mill's sister. You never saw anything so pretty. I heard there that the Ministers had given up Evesham, and Ld Chandos brings in a Bill to give it to Birmingham.<sup>1</sup> If I were he I wd. propose one for Birmingham & one for Manchester. Ld Londonderry was there & more civil to me than usual, & in talking of foreign matters was anything but friendly to the Govt. It is impossible to understand him, for he is mad and shabby beyond measure. Henry Chol[mondeley] thought that for a new man Mr Praed *set the House right* too much about taxes, but, he had been informed by Herries, understood his subject perfectly, and was quite correct. Everybody considered the speech excellent. They give up Cape wine & talk of modifying cotton (they will have to give it up)<sup>2</sup> & we shall have a good case upon Portugal.<sup>3</sup> Ld.

<sup>1</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, third series, II. 665 (18 February). Lord Chandos was an ultra-tory Reformer.

<sup>2</sup> Althorp agreed to reduce the proposed duty on raw cotton.

<sup>3</sup> The opposition's complaint was that the government had broken faith with Portugal by not giving her notice of an intention to modify the duties on Portuguese wines.

Strangford does it in the Lords on Monday.<sup>1</sup> I have seen no one today yet, I am going to walk out with Chas., & shall call on Lady Chol[mondeley] who is come. Young Ly. C. is *not in a way*; the old housekeeper wrote to her something about it, & she wrote back word, 'God's will be done.' Such ridiculous *cant*. I shall be delighted to see you back again.

I have been keeping my letter open in hopes of seeing the Duke but I suppose he will call from the Lords. It is six o'clock & I have not got a frank, which is stupid. Yr. writ was moved last night,<sup>2</sup> but perhaps they may forget & send this free. I will keep it to the last moment for the chance of a frank from the D[uke]. . . .<sup>3</sup>

#### 144. John Wilson Croker to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*West Molesey, Surrey, Easter Monday [4 April 1831].*— . . . What are we doing in the political world—every effort ought to be made (for our adversaries are doing incredible things) to keep together & *increase* the 301.<sup>4</sup> Our press seems asleep—people complain that we have no papers with us, but the *two* <sup>5</sup> we have we do not support; my illness dispirits & disables me from doing much in that way, but where are all the rest, & what are they about? We were certainly ill-advised not to throw out the Bill the first night, tho' I believe that the discussion has done good, & that people are regaining their senses,—indeed, *I* believe, the frenzy was *never* so violent as it was represented—the name of the *King*—the influence of a *Government*—the violence of the press, & the voice of the populace, liberals & radicals, made some weak-minded men say that '*something ought to be done*', but except these something-mongers, there has been little change in the mind of the great body of the country—the clamor has not been louder, nor the petitions more numerous than I remember on three or four former occasions; & in 1784 & in 1793 Reform itself was more menacing, so far as general support went, than it is now. . . . I know that some of our friends think that *we* could not form a Government—*any* Government would be better than this. *I* hope never to be in office again, but I would go back to the Admiralty if upon that alone depended the formation of a new Administration, & I suppose all our party would do whatever might be thought necessary to bring about so desirable an object. I believe the King *means well*—but he does not know who to believe as to what *well means*. He ought to be told; & I wonder that he has not been—as I learn that *all the ladies* are anti-Reformers, as well they may, for in about 18 months their rank would be abolished & their allowances stopp'd, & they would have to seek a refuge—God knows where.

<sup>1</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, third series, ii. 745 (21 February)

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, ii. 624 (17 February).

<sup>3</sup> The letter is addressed to Woodford, Kettering, and was not franked. The postage was evidently eightpence

<sup>4</sup> The second reading of the Reform Bill was carried on 22 March by 302 *v.* 301.

<sup>5</sup> The *Morning Post* and the *Albion*.

## 145. J. C. Herries to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

5, *Albemarle Street*, 7 April 1831.— . . . I hear that the Whigs are active in their vacation even beyond their usual habits ; in which, by the bye, they so much excel us. Ld. Duncannon is sowing promises and threats in all directions to catch or to nullify, votes ; the peerage is not neglected. Hitherto, according to our accounts, he has had little success : but the result alone can decide that point.

Wetherell has been twice with me, to make some representations which they desire to be communicated to Peel. There is every desire to restore a cordial intercourse, on the ultra-Tory side—I wish it may be met in the same spirit on the other. If it be not, those who refuse the overture may lay to their own account all the mischief which must inevitably follow a triumph of the present Governr.

The Duke has delighted everybody by the manner in which he has re-established a good understanding with the ultras.

I have commissioned a good hand to get up a pamphlet dissecting the Bill clause by clause. It is now in the press. I will send you a copy, interleaved, tomorrow in order that Arbuthnot may look it over & return it with any annotations that may occur to him. The press will be kept open some days. I have not read the pamphlet myself, & therefore cannot yet judge if it will answer my expectations formed of the writer, who is Nelson Coleridge, the author of several good tracts. But his name need not be mentioned.

We have sold 30,000 of the anti-reform tracts ! So you see that good tracts may be circulated as well as bad if good men will be as active as the bad always are.

I am going to meet a party of ex-official men at the Athenæum today. . . .

## 146. William Holmes to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

10 *Grafton Street*, 10 June 1831.—I have just finished sending 266 notes to M.P.'s to attend next week, & I am quite certain they will obey the summons. Lord Rosslyn is writing to the peers, & I understand that the Bishops still continue firm. . . .

There are rumours afloat that Lords Palmerston & Goderich are very much dissatisfied with their present position.

I have seen the Count Duval, one of the deputation sent to offer the Crown to Prince Saxe Cobourgh. The Prince has formally refused the offer, & Duval tells me that he is quite certain that a French army will take possession of it before this day month, & that a general war will be the consequence.<sup>1</sup> I hope so, as it may stop the Reform Bill. The squadron at Portsmouth is destined for [the] Scheldt. The creoles at Berbice have risen & massacred all the Portuguese there. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Prince Leopold accepted the offer of the Belgian crown on the 26th.

## 147. Sir Henry Hardinge to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Wednesday, 17 August [1831].—* . . . The blunderings of the Grey Ministry—the duperies of the French—the growing indignation of the people at the piracy committed agt. the Portugse Fleet<sup>1</sup>—their exultation at the defeats of the *braves* Belges—the demands of Ld. Anglesea<sup>2</sup> for 4000 addl. troops—the defection of the *Times* newspaper—the stickfast state of the Reform Bill in Parlt.—the stagnation of all other business, & the general sentiment of the Ministerial incapacity—are to me sure indications of an approaching retirement, if Peel has the courage to take advantage of the state of things. He thinks they are not ripe for the coup de grace—and certainly until the foreign policy is more openly develloped, & reform has become more unpalateable, it wd. be desireable to allow them to consummate their own defeat & disgrace—but the mischief they are doing in the meantime is untold—they are bargaining with the Irish about Yeomanry & Tithes, & I hear that the Archbishop of Canterbury's Tithe Composition Bill which Brougham & Ld. Grey so highly eulogised, is arrested in the Lords because Lord Grey apprehends it does not go far enough to please the palate of the Dissenters, & that a positive *commutation* is intended to be made. . . .

## 148. William Holmes to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*London, 18 August 1831.—* . . . Lord Althorp & Stanley had a meeting of the Irish members who support Government at Downing Street this morning—when he submitted a plan for reorganizing the Irish yeomanry. The Radicals with Lord Kille[e]n at their head refused any measure short of a total disbanding of the whole of that force. Other members from the north objected to the measure as an insult to the Irish yeomanry, & they separated, all parties abusing the Government. Duncannon goes to Ireland tomorrow for six weeks, & leaves the Woods & Forests, Waterloo Bridge, Reform, & Buckingham House to take care of themselves. I hear he is going to give up his office.<sup>3</sup> I had a long conversation with Sir Henry Blackwood, who came up from Windsor yesterday with the King. To my great surprise he abused the Reform & the Ministers, & pitied the King very much, who, he said, was not well, & fretted to death both with foreign & domestic politicks. He said you may rely upon it that the King will not hear of making new peers to carry the Reform Bill, let the consequences be what they may. The Duke is looking well & in very good spirits. The cholera morbus has broken out in a frightful manner at Vienna. I wish it was in Downing Street. . . .

*Ibid., House of Commons, 24 August 1831.—* . . . We had two divisions on the late Dublin election report, & you will not fail to observe how boldly the Whigs to a man supported the shameful & open interference of the Castle. I did not vote on the last division, as God knows, I have done twice as much

<sup>1</sup> On 11 July, Don Miguel having refused to liberate some French subjects whom he had unjustly imprisoned, the French attacked and captured his warships

<sup>2</sup> Lord-lieutenant of Ireland.      <sup>3</sup> Of first commissioner of woods and forests.

in that way as Lord Anglesey did, but not in so bungling a manner. I hear that Cabinet decided on increasing the army this day—by calling out ten thousand of the veterans, so as to leave the line disposedly [*sic*]. This looks like war, or what is worse, a rebellion in Ireland. There has been a serious quarrel between the Duke of Richmond & Stanley respecting Lord Anglesey. Lord Derby<sup>1</sup> has for the present reconciled them, but they are in a ticklish position.

There was [a meeting] on Monday last of the *proprietors* of the Times newspaper, when it was discovered that in consequence of their advocacy of the present Government the sale of their paper had diminished very considerably in the City, particularly since the capture of the Portuguese ships & the march of the French into Belgium. This accounts for the violent attack in this day's paper of the French & our own Ministers.<sup>2</sup> Sir James Graham & Parnell have carried their point of preventing a burst at the Coronation. This has consequently set all the naval & military people furious.

The Duke has decided upon having our old Fish Dinner on Wednesday the 31st of August, & has extended it to all good Tories who chose to attend.<sup>3</sup> This keeps me very busy, as I have to send out all the notes & to make the arrangements for it. Nearly one hundred have already sent in their names. I fear we must dine at Blackwall as there is no room at Greenwich large enough to contain us.

The peers still continue firm & purposed, & we shall yet damage the Bill most seriously in our House. We are now in Committee.

We have carried an anti for New Ross—Mr Wigram—so that we have carried every election since the meeting of Parliament.

*Ibid.*, London, 25 August 1831.—Our accounts from Dublin are of the very best kind, Shaw 974, Ingestrie 948, Latouche 732, & O'Loughlin 663. Sir Robert Shaw, the father of the candidate, writes that he had received a communication from Latouche that he would not put them to any further trouble after Wednesday. This is all it ought to be. The Irish faction are quite dismayed at the result, & tho' it has cost us dearly, it is money well expended.

I have seen the Duke who is looking remarkably well. The Duke of Cumberland has invited himself to the Fish Dinner. That thief Hume has given notice of a motion for Saturday next, vidt. that the House shall in future sit every day at twelve o'clock, & that the Reform question shall take

<sup>1</sup> Stanley's grandfather.

<sup>2</sup> 'The apparent weakness of our Government at home encourages foreigners to beard us, as they imagine, with impunity. The languor or incompetence of some of our men in office, which has shown itself so conspicuously in the management of a great domestic question, upon which they were feebly opposed within doors and strenuously and unanimously supported without, *must* have impressed all strangers with a notion that the existing Cabinet is not one very bold or very skilful in any branch of public warfare. We do not approve much of some at least of the views of foreign policy ascribed to the Duke of Wellington, but we really doubt whether, in relation to Portugal or Belgium, or even to Greece or Algiers, Great Britain and France would, under his guidance, have stood at this moment in a position comparatively disreputable for the former Power.'

<sup>3</sup> The annual ministerial fish dinner at Greenwich or Blackwall is described by Lord Campbell in *Hardcastle's Campbell*, II. 50. See, too, *Greville memoirs*, 4 September 1839.

precedence for every day in the week of every other question. This Peel means to resist, & if Hume perseveres, I must forego the pleasure I promised myself of going to Woodford on that day—as I know Peel (who is such a queer tempered fellow) would never forgive me was I absent, & besides I find wherever I am, our young ones run away. I had hoped that with the loss of my office I should have had some rest, but in the whole course of my parliamentary life I have never fagged so hard as I have done in the last six months. We did not get thro' more than ten lines of one clause last night, tho' we were seven hours in Committee, & we shall spend this evening on the remainder of the said clause. I shall write to you again tomorrow evening.

Sir Edward Codrington's fleet is taking on board four months water & provisions. The Duke of Wellington spent some time this morning with Lord Grey on the subject of the Belgian fortresses. What a heartrending business it must be to him to see those places upon which he spent so much time & expense demolished.

#### 149. John Charles Herries to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Albemarle Street, 16 September 1831.*— . . . I do not recover from my black fit. The indications of the last few days make me more gloomy. The Government are now evidently prepared for defeat in the Lords upon the Bill, and as evidently determined to carry it through ultimately at all hazards. The King will go all lengths with them. Lord Graham came to me yesterday to say that he knew from a quarter, quite to be relied upon, that the Government *expect & hope* to be beat upon a preliminary point before the 2d reading of the Bill; & therefore intend to make peers—and that they are in possession of the King's acquiescence. I have written a line to the Duke to let him know this.

The wine duties are a hopeless case. I made a smart attack upon the measure, & upon the Govt. generally last night, which they could not answer, & which my friends in the House told me was effective: but it was of no use to divide.<sup>1</sup> We had a poor attendance, & their troops were well marshalled & ready to stand by them, thick & thin; and *we are never reported*. Luckily Peel was not there. If he had been we should have sustained a discomfiture, because he would have thrown us overboard. No person who has not seen this House of Commons can form a notion of it. We who have seen it can judge somewhat of the character & composition of the future reformed House.

The Bankes's will, I fear, shrink meanly from the contest in Dorsetshire. I believe it is William Bankes who is most to blame in this. Lord Ashley and Peach went yesterday to Strathfieldsaye to get a pressing letter from the Duke to urge Bankes to stand. If that succeeds we may yet carry Dorsetshire. But I fear the characters of the parties. Old Bankes has never done anything but mischief in his life<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, third series, vii. 78.

<sup>2</sup> The bye-election was caused by John Calcraft's suicide. Lord Ashley defeated the whig candidate, William Ponsonby, Duncannon's brother.

## 150. William Holmes to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*House of Commons, Monday [19 September 1831].*—A most extraordinary circumstance has just occurred. Lord Althorpe moved the Order of the Day for the 3d reading of the Reform Bill. At exactly 5 o'clock Peel was in the House of Lords, & Scarlett, who by agreement was to have opened the debate, did not get up as quickly as he ought, & the Speaker put the question & said the ayes have it. Nothing was left to the few in the House but to divide, & the numbers were 103 to 68.<sup>1</sup> So the Bill is read a 3d time, & our debate must take place on the last question, 'that this Bill do pass', when we hope to have a very good division. The Lords all continue firm, & the Bill will be thrown [out] by a majority of from 38 to 44. In spite of their 24 new peers, I know Lords Grey & Holland are prepared for the loss of the Bill & are in very bad spirits, & anticipate the worst news from Paris in consequence of the fall of Warsaw<sup>2</sup>—& the high tone lately assumed by Esterhazy & Bulow in the conferences.

Peel came to town on Thursday last. He is determined to make a most violent attack on the Bill tonight, & I am certain he will do it well. I am still suffering from violent cramps in my left leg. I scarcely get any sleep from it, & I cannot lay up for a few days. I go every morning to Charles Street,<sup>3</sup> where I am obliged to answer one hundred foolish questions put to me daily, & at four I go to the House, where I remain till 2 o'clock the next morning.

Old Bankes & his son William have cruelly deceived us as to Dorset. Neither will now stand, nor will they give a shilling to Lord Ashley, who, if he had the means, *could carry it*. Indeed I do not think that Ponsonby would stand if Ashley offered himself. . . .

The Paris mob broke into Pozzo di Borgo's house in Paris & gutted it completely on Saturday night.

*Ibid.*, 23 September 1831.—I have scarcely recovered from the fatigues of Wednesday night; I was thirteen hours in the House, & I never, I believe, sat down.<sup>4</sup> I remained in the Lobby & kept our people well together.

We voted present in the House	236
tellers	2
paired off	12
absent from illness	9
ditto from idleness	7
	<hr/>
	266

Among the latter 7 was Mr Roberts of Beudly, who as usual neither paired & would not come up, as he was engaged to a Corporation dinner. However,

<sup>1</sup> 113 to 58, according to *Parl. Deb.* (third series, vii. 141. See Hansard's comments, p. 142).

<sup>2</sup> On 8 September, marking practically the end of the Polish rebellion.

<sup>3</sup> The tory party-headquarters.

<sup>4</sup> The Reform Bill passed the commons by 345 v. 236.



the Lords are I believe staunch. There is a report that Lord Lake & the Duke of St. Albans have ratted.<sup>1</sup> Of the latter I can believe anything, as he is a fool. The former I hope will act rightly. Lord Ashley is off for Dorset, & we hope that he will carry his election. We have got above £3,000 for him. Mr Arbuthnot must vote. The poll opens this day week. The Duke thinks there will be a majority of 45.<sup>2</sup> I am more moderate. Pray do come to town. Both Mr Arbuthnot & yourself can be of great use to the cause in the Lords . . .

*Ibid.*, Monday [26 September 1831].—*Private* between ourselves, Ashley is not the man I took him for, but more of this when I see you. We are doing well in the Lords, Lord Harrowby quite firm & will oppose the 2d reading, & has written to several friends of his, all of whom were in my doubtful list, to implore them to resist the 2d readg. This will be of great importance as it will keep the Bishops steady. The A.B. of York has taken his proxy from Canterbury & has offered it to London, who has not accepted it.<sup>3</sup> Lord Nelson has taken his proxy from Lord Grey & sent it to Lord Sidmouth.<sup>4</sup> We got the Duke of Marlborough to take his seat, & he has left his proxy with Lord Shaftesbury. I think Lord Tankerville will not vote, tho' I have given him to them. I am sorry we shall not have Lord Rivers; the Duke of Dorset should have got him.<sup>5</sup>

*Ibid.*, Thursday, [29 September 1831].— . . . Ashley's writ has been moved, & he stands for the County. Mr Farquhason, the most influential man in the county, proposes him, & Sir Edward Baker seconds. The yeomen are all in his favor, & I am very sanguine of our success. . . . We also send a man to Poole to annoy the reformers. I wish I was out of this vortex of hurry & confusion. I am tired to death, & nothing enables me to go on but the certain conviction that the Lords will do their duty well. . . .

### 151. Sir Henry Hardinge to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

1 October [1831].—Dorsetshire the first day gains Ponsonby a majority of 28—271

243

28 with 108 unpolled last night, for Ashley who could not get up. I live in well-founded hopes of Ashley's success—in Portland which was Calcraft's stronghold, he has 150 promises out [of] 240—& of the 90 remaining it is said Ponsonby has only 60. A Mr Farquhason, a fox-hunter, a Sir Chs. Knightley of Dorsetshire, has roused the yeomanry in the Tory interest, & we are in good spirits.

<sup>1</sup> The duke voted for the second reading; Lord Lake abstained

<sup>2</sup> Against the second reading of the Reform Bill in the lords. The majority was actually 41.

<sup>3</sup> The archbishop of Canterbury opposed the second reading of the Reform Bill; the others did not vote

<sup>4</sup> He voted for the bill, by proxy.

<sup>5</sup> The dukes of Marlborough and Dorset, and Lords Shaftesbury, Tankerville and Rivers opposed the Bill.

The Press & the Radical Whigs, identified Don-Keys<sup>1</sup> re-election to the Mayoralty and reform—as the test that the Tory assertions of a reaction were lies. He is beaten today, & Laurie more than 100 ahead, who is a very moderate reformer—a Tory in disguise.

Wm. Ward at the head of the merchants & bankers has convened a meeting this day to petition the Lords to act according to their own judgment &c., most numerous attended. The Kent meeting on Penenden Heath about  $\frac{1}{2}$  the former in nos. & about  $\frac{1}{10}$  of what it was on the Catholic question. Surrey meeting a complete failure—not 50 persons attended. The rascally press conceals these facts—but the Lords know the truth & are stout.

I hear we have a majority of 17 Bishops & 21 lay Lords—38—but certainly more than 30—& the latter no renders it impossible to pack the Lords. Burdett is to make a motion seconded by Littleton when the Bill is lost, to address his Majesty to persevere & not to accept the resignation of the Ministers.<sup>2</sup> God forbid they shd. resign at this moment—for neither the Duke or Peel could bring forward & carry any Reform Bill, & after the King's folly, no stable Govt. could be formed until that question is settled. It will probably end in a compromise.

The attack agt. the Queen in the Times, is a piece of spite of Brougham's. She recd him at Windsor with marked coolness, & the King said after dinner, 'the Bill will be lost on the 2nd reading, & the Ministers will resign'.

Brougham's job in the Bankrupt Bill is to give to himself £18,500 a yr. & £6000 instead of £4000 retiring pension; to pension off 70 Coms., some of his own recent appointts. at £200 a yr., & to make 50 new appts. costing £48000 a yr.!!!

The Duke made an admirable speech on the *French prefect*, Leopold.

## 152. John Wilson Croker to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

21 Brunswick Terrace, Brighton, 9 October [1831].—Am I not a good prophet? Did I not tell you 40? I reckoned on 20 lay & 20 episcopals; but I am not satisfied. In the first place the course of the debate was more *reformish* in the Lords than it had been with us. Lords Harrowby, Wharncliffe, &c went farther than Peel or I did, farther, I think, than Lord Grey would have gone a year ago: and what I said, from the first hour (to A[rbuthnot]'s great indignation) is likely to become true, namely, that we shall have A reform & that ANY reform will (by a process, more or less slow, but quite certain) overthrow the Lords & the Monarchy. In the second place, the number of lay Lords, 20, is quite inadequate to the occasion. It ought to have been double that number. *Twenty* is rather an agitating & exasperating, than a triumphant & *quieting* majority. It is an insufficient dose of laudanum. In short, I am as little satisfied as it is possible to be.

I have been here two days, but shall be in town tomorrow noon. As I

<sup>1</sup> Sir John Key, lord mayor of London, 1830 and 1831.

<sup>2</sup> This motion of confidence was proposed by Lord Ebrington and seconded by Charles Dundas.

shall not be able, probably, to see the Duke, before I am obliged to go down to the House, I shall endeavor to call in Carlton Gardens to hear what line people are expected to take. I dare say you will have heard, or if you have not, perhaps you would kindly enquire so as to be enabled to put me '*au courant*' on my arrival. For *my own* part, *my* inclination is to do nothing. One might make a vivacious attack on the Ministers, who, except on Reform, are really objects for ridicule, not for invective—but *cui bono*? which is Latin for *what good will it do*? I have no political object in the world but to *postpone* the revolution. I want nothing—I would take nothing—I am, I assure you candidly & solemnly, entirely contented with my present condition, & if it be not violently changed for the worse, I have no desire to change it for, what the world would call, the better. My only object, then, is to delay the revolution, which will involve us all in general ruin & to do that, I am ready to do anything, if I could see the *anything* which it could fall to my lot to do. Of some utility I believe I have been, by my exposure of the Bill in our House, which certainly diminished its popularity, & rendered its rejection more easy; but *now*, higher & wider considerations must come into operation, which those only who are likely to have to deal with their results as Ministers, whether in possession or expectation of office, can properly decide upon. I am not one of those expectants, & I therefore feel that I have little to do in the discussions that are about to arise, but as far as my *vote* goes, I do not contemplate that it can ever be otherwise than with the Duke, & I shall therefore be anxious to hear tomorrow how he looks at our prospects, & what line he & his personal friends mean to take. . . .<sup>1</sup>

#### 153. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Woodford, 26 October 1831.*— . . . Our gt. anxiety now is about Cambridge-shire. It will be a severe struggle. How it will end no one can tell. Our party have great hopes, but are not free from alarm, as about Ely & in the Fens the Radicals are swarming. The Poll begins tomorrow. . . .

*Ibid., Drayton House, Monday, 31 October 1831.*— . . . It was a foolish thing to contest Cambridgeshire. We shall be beaten hollow—at least so it seems, as in 2 days polling we were above 400 behind.<sup>2</sup> It will take away much of the advantage of succeeding in Dorsetshire. . . .

#### 154. William Holmes to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*23 November 1831.*— . . . I am sending out letters to all our friends to attend on the 6th.<sup>3</sup> The Duke has desired me to do the same with the peers,

<sup>1</sup> Arbuthnot wrote to his son Charles (15 October 1832): 'He [Croker] is the greatest bore and torment alive. He does nothing but say all day long that there will be a complete revolution before the year's out. To my horror I learn that he arrived here [Sudbourne] at six this morning. I thought we were quit of him' (He and Croker had been the Duke's guests at Walmer.)

<sup>2</sup> Richard Greaves Townley was elected on 1 November. He supported the Reform Bill.

<sup>3</sup> When parliament re-assembled.

& send them all blank proxies for those who cannot come, to sign & send them to town. I have enough to do, & I believe I am destined never to enjoy another day's shooting. I have received this morning twenty-two letters from persons begging me to pair them off.

*Ibid.*, 23 November 1831.— . . . I have written to him [Peel] to know whether I shall write to our friends to attend at the meeting of Parliament.

#### 155. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Apethorpe*, 28 November 1831.— . . . We intend to muster as strong as we can on the 6th. The D. of Wn. has told Holmes to write to all the peers, & Peel has told him to get up all the commoners. I don't envy Ministers. They have brought themselves as well as all of us into a desperate state, & now they wd. back out if they knew how. Don't mention what I write to you, tho' you will know part of it from other quarters. In the greatest confidence I will tell you that some short time ago, just after the Bristol outrages,<sup>1</sup> the D. of Wn wrote to the King that his throne wd. be gone if he allowed the existence of the Associations.<sup>2</sup> He wrote a most capital paper & desired his Majesty to show it to his Ministers.<sup>3</sup> The King took fright & insisted upon the proclamation against the Unions.<sup>4</sup> This must make the Radicals furious; & the more so as Ld Grey, Ld. Althorp, & Ld. J. Russell had (as you recollect) corresponded with the Birmingham Union. Lord Grey finding himself in gt. difficulties made an overture thro' Ld. Palmerston to Ld. Wharncliffe to come to town, & to see whether, by mutual concession, a Bill might not be brought in wch. the Tories wd. not oppose. They met; but I think that the negotiation will lead to no result other than the lowering of the Govt. Ld. Grey insists upon keeping Schedule A.<sup>5</sup> I don't know that the negotiation is quite broken off. Neither the Duke nor Peel wd. be parties to it; but the Duke has given Ld. Wharncliffe excellent advice with wch. I know that he is highly pleased. Thus therefore it stands. You now know all; but pray do not utter a word. We surely stand better, inasmuch as the Ministers have lowered their tone, must have offended the Radicals, & must therefore be greatly weakened. What a figure they will cut when they bring in their Bill to suppress Unions. We must make the greatest show we can. . . .

#### 156. Charles Arbuthnot to his wife.

*Carlton Gardens*, 21 December 1831.— . . . We are going to form a great Club<sup>6</sup> to be the best in London. The Duke & Peel are to be of the Comtee., & I have promised to ask the D. of Portland &c &c to be of it also. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Caused by the arrival of the ultra-tory Sir Charles Wetherell, the recorder of the City, and one of the leading opponents of the Reform Bill, to perform his judicial duties. The Mansion House, Bishop's Palace and three gaols were burnt down.

<sup>2</sup> *W.N.D.*, viii. 30 (5 November)

<sup>3</sup> This does not appear to be the case.

<sup>4</sup> 22 November (*W.N.D.*, viii 80).

<sup>5</sup> The list, appended to the Reform Bill, of boroughs which were to be deprived of both their members.

<sup>6</sup> The Carlton.

I have not called on Herries as he wd. kill me with croaking. . . .

*Ibid.*, Carlton Gardens, 22 December 1831.— . . . The Duke is convinced that there is already a great reaction. I believe there is some—I am not sanguine enough to think it is very great. The Duke is also full of the P. de Condé's trial; that is, the trial about his Will.<sup>1</sup> Both he & Lord Aberdeen, who called on me yesterday, think that it will destroy the King, Louis Philippe, & you will see the trial commented on in *John Bull*.<sup>2</sup> Both the Duke & Ld. Aberdeen feel that Ministers are up to their ears in difficulties on their foreign affairs, as well as upon all internal. The Dutch will not give way. . . . Lord Hill told me in the Secretary's room that he had just come from Brighton—that the King was quite well & in high spirits. That he (Ld. Hill) sat by the Queen at dinner—that she said to him 'now you & I must drink a glass of wine, & we must drink to the D. of Welln.'s better health'. Lord Hill said he shd. inform the Duke, & she then begged him to add that it came from her heart. She abused the Whigs, & speaking of Lord Howe she asked Ld. Hill how he should like to have some one else come & turn away yr. servants. . . .<sup>3</sup>

#### 157. The Marquess of Tavistock to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Oakeley*, 24 December [1831]. *Private*.— . . . To be sure, if you think that the D. of Wellington & Sr. R. Peel, by taking Reform into their own hands, wd. have destroyed their characters, I cannot feel surprised at your answer to my question. I had imagined that they were quite unpledged upon the subject until the Duke's unfortunate declaration against all reform, & I had not calculated upon his being deserted by that portion of the Tory party that supported him on the Catholic question. Althorp thought there was good reason for opposing his Govt. systematically on public grounds. Hence the acts you so much complain of.

I thought differently, I confess, & attended no Opposition meeting during the D. of Wellington's Administration. I never heard of any concert with Mr Banks until I got your letter, & with regard to Sir E. Knatchbull's amendment,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The prince of Condé, of the house of Bourbon, who died in August 1830, bequeathed the bulk of his property to Louis Philippe's youngest son. The princes of the house of Rohan, Condé's other relatives, contested the validity of the will on the ground that it was extorted from the deceased by force and circumvention. Some people suspected that Condé had been murdered after he had decided to alter his will in favour of the young duke of Bordeaux. Louis Philippe's manoeuvres, when duke of Orleans, to procure for his family the possessions of the Condé family, brought him into much discredit with his subjects. The affair revealed his connection with Madame de Feuchères, who had lived with the prince of Condé.

<sup>2</sup> *John Bull*, 25 December.

<sup>3</sup> In October Lord Howe, the queen's lord chamberlain, was, at the government's instigation, dismissed from his office for voting against the Reform Bill on the 7th, although previously to his vote he had received the king's assurance that he had the right to vote as he pleased.

<sup>4</sup> An ultra-tory amendment to the Address on the King's Speech at the opening of the 1830 Session (4 February) was defeated by 158 v. 105. The amendment was supported by whigs, Canningites, ultra-tories and radicals, and was opposed by ministerialists, whigs and radicals. It insisted that the distress of the people was universal, the Government maintaining that it was partial.

I shd. have voted against it with Hume & Hobhouse if I had not been in Devonshire, & so I told Althorp & my brother<sup>1</sup> at the time.

However, I have long ceased to take a very active part in politics, on account of my health, & it matters very [little] to anybody except my constituents<sup>2</sup> & myself what I think or what course I pursue. I have been a Reformer all my life, but I see that the question has now brought us into a position of no ordinary difficulty & danger. . . .

### 158. William J. Bankes to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Kingston Hall, 28 December 1831.*— . . . Do pray impress on Ld. Westmoreland that he has a much more direct parliamentary & political connexion with this county than Ld. Salisbury has, who yet comes forward with an hundred pounds for the defence of Ashley's petition<sup>3</sup>; that your neighbour where you are now staying, Ld. Brownlow, has no connexion with us at all & yet does the same, & that in both instances they are *second* donations, having given before to the contest. Do try to shame him into it or get Lady Georgiana<sup>4</sup> to do it. I got upon this topic because I hear that Lady Jersey has not succeeded with him, but that had not need be supposed to be known, & possibly after all is not true. Try the Duke of Rutland also desperately, but I think the D. of Wellington will have secured for us something from him. You see what is uppermost with me, & so it ought to be; I was no party to the original embarking in that election, but defending the seat is a very different thing. We owe it to Ashley, & we owe it still more (I mean the whole party) to our character. If it were thrown up I will tell you what you may read in the Times the very next day; I feel as certain of it as if I had seen it there. 'Talk of the failure of funds of a few hundred pounds to defend such a seat! And are the Tories really so besotted as to believe that any rational man is to swallow the tale that in a party which includes the Dukes of Northumberland & Buccleugh, enough could not be collected in Charles Street to meet such an exigency as this. No, the difficulty was not there. Look at the Petition & you will soon find out the secret, you will see that gross & corrupt bribery are there fearlessly charged on the party & might have been as fearlessly repelled if they were innocent. Why it is not repelled let them answer, or plead guilty to the charge—& here we have then the true secret of this wonder of wonders, of this boasted election, of this spontaneous reaction & exhibition of strong & altered feeling. Purses could be found for that, & would be found now as readily, but that it is pleasanter to pay for a triumph than a disgrace, & to retreat quietly than to brave an expulsion.' I flatter myself that I have given you the very topics which the 'leading ministerial journal' would put forward—& is it not worth almost any exertion to avoid such a dilemma? I am sure I have not been

<sup>1</sup> Lord John Russell.

<sup>2</sup> He was M.P. for Bedfordshire

<sup>3</sup> His opponent, William Ponsonby, unsuccessfully petitioned the house of commons against his return. See Hodder's *Shaftesbury* [1886], i 121-4.

<sup>4</sup> Probably Lord Bathurst's daughter

inactive myself, nor, I may say, unsuccessful in my applications; I have very nearly 1500 *booked* in my hands. Cannot some small mite be got from Cartwright at his election? Others seemed to do so much for him that he may perhaps have a fellow feeling. Pray try, if you see your way. . . .

**159. Charles Arbuthnot's memorandum of a conversation with Edward Ellice.**

[? 1831.] When riding I overtook Ellice & Holmes. We asked each other how we did. Ellice said he was as well as he cd. be in times of such excitement, & then asked whether I was in want of any high office. I replied that I was not surprised that offices were going a begging, but that as for me I rejoiced that my day was over; & I added that the times were bad indeed, but that they had made their bed & they must rest in it as they could.

On this Ellice cried out that it was not they but their predecessors who had brought things to their present state, & he hoped & trusted that this wd. be proclaimed loudly in Parliament. I told him that I always made a point of not talking on politics with those from whom I differed, but that as such was his opinion, I earnestly hoped with him that it wd. be proclaimed, as I cd. venture to say that they wd. receive such an answer as they wd. not like, & as wd. lay them flat upon their backs. He rejoined that all was owing to their predecessors—upon wch. I told him that as he wd. know my mind, I must say to him that they were the most iniquitous men that ever breathed. Not near so bad, he said, as those who had gone before them. If those, I replied, who had gone before them were as bad as their successors, they deserved in my opinion to be d—d.

**160. William Holmes to Mrs. Arbuthnot.**

11 *January* 1832.—I have this day received twenty-six letters from M.P.s, most of whom write to ask, will not the 1st of February do as well as the 20th of January? <sup>1</sup>, & I have to answer all these stupid inquiries, or they will not come, therefore my not writing to almost any others can be easily accounted for. Indeed I never now am able to finish my letters before 7 o'clock.

I am very anxious to have a good attendance at the meeting of Parliament, because I am convinced that there never was any period, since these people came into power, in which they felt themselves so embarrassed as they do at this moment, & particularly from what has taken place at Brighton when Lord Grey was there,<sup>2</sup> my belief is that up to last Monday night the King had given no permission for the creation of peers, & if any individual such as Lord Harrowby, the Duke of Wellington or Sir Robert Peel was to tell him this

<sup>1</sup> When the house of commons was to go into committee on the Reform Bill.

<sup>2</sup> On the 3rd He asked the king to create a small number of peers so that the bill could be read a second time in the lords. The king asked to have the cabinet's advice in writing.

afternoon that a Government would be formed for him, he would never create a peer to carry the Reform question, & that he would part with Grey & Co. tomorrow was he assured of this I may be mistaken in my opinions, but I can assure you they are formed from facts & circumstances which have occurred within these last forty-eight hours at Brighton, & I know the King's assurances or conversations are not to be depended upon, but he is now alarmed beyond anything you can imagine.

Since I commenced writing to you I have had more than ten persons calling upon me. . . .

#### 161. Sir Henry Hardinge to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

18 January [1832].—I have got into such a labyrinth of political correspondence with persons who are conducting papers on our side, such as Messrs Gleig, Singleton &c. exclusive of peers out of town, that in office I never had more private correspondence to get through—& this must be my apology for appearing to drop correspondence with my oldest and dearest friends. I hope you approve of John Bull for the last 3 or 4 Sundays. On Irish affairs Arbuthnot will recognize in substance some of the letters I showed him. The arts. on La Feuchères have had gt. effect in Paris <sup>1</sup>—& anything which shows up Ld. A[n]glesey the *real* victor at Waterloo, & the citizen K. of France as the shabby accomplice of a courtesan & a murderer, must tend to damage Lord Grey & his infamous colleagues, who deserve impeachment more than any men who ever usurped power by mob excitement.

They, the wretches, looked low & sulky yesterday on the Treasury bench. I really begin to believe that the K[ing] will not make peers to carry the Bill. Lord Wharnccliffe had, as you have heard, a long audience in which he forcibly explained to the K. the danger of the measure, assuring his Majesty that 5/6 of the country were for a more moderate measure, *even Ld. Grey himself* if his foolish pledges wd. permit him—that the K. thanked him & agreed with him, & assured him he wd. not make peers. Ld. W. asked if he might state this resolution to his Tory friends who reqd. to be rallied. The K. assured him again of his resolution & of his permission to declare it.

The D. of W., as you know, wrote an admirable letter <sup>2</sup> to Ld. Strangford which I have no doubt has been seen by the K.—it wd. frighten & *annoy* him—but the *annoyance* wd. be, I imagine, of a nature to urge him to meet the demand of his Minister. He says 'the K. knows all *this*, (speaking of the effects of the Reform Bill) as well as we do'—It is said the K. has been abandoned? By whom? Not by me or by my colleagues. I trust H.M. will not *degenerate* from the resolution of his ancestors' In short a letter which speaks out.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. 15 January: ' . . . All the low, petty meannesses of his [Louis Philippe's] private life, all the intrigues and fawnings upon Madame de Feuchères, and all his contrivances to achieve his point in *that* case, have their parallels in his tamperings and intrigues with Perier and his faction. . . . ' See, too, long articles on 1 and 8 January.

<sup>2</sup> *W.N.D.*, viii. 155 (12 January).



Lord Camden will, I think, go down to Brighton this week with the Kent petition & will speak out—Lord Eldon has asked for an audience. The D. of Buckingham has written a very powerful letter—Ld. Grenville has refused to pay the money for the Dutch Loan out of the Exchequer,<sup>1</sup> & Tom Grenville says that his old friends the Whigs ought to be impeached, & has the means of letting this be known at Brighton.

But the K. says, I hear, admitting the truth of what you all say, how am I to get out of the scrape? Lord W[harncliffe], I hear, says, tell yr. Minister that the Crown ought not to be endangered to save the Minister's consistency—that you will only go half way, & that if he won't recede, you won't make peers—& let him, Ld Grey, in the face of a r[oya]l wish for moderate reform, resign if he will.

Then many of our friends who see that some reform must be carried, suggest that Lords W. & Harrowby<sup>2</sup> should detail to the Hse of Lords what has passed with Ld. Grey—that the impediment to moderate reform is Lord Grey & his pledges—& that he, Ld. W., will originate a Bill in the Hse. of Lords, justified in so doing, by the fact that the Lords threw the late Bill out because it was so vicious it could not be amended in Comee., & that a Bill as efficient & as objectionable has been again brought forward in the Coms., which, if their Lordships are consistent & firm, & the K. true to his Crown & the Constitution, by not creating peers, must again by thrown out of the Lords, owing as before to Lord Grey's indiscreet pledges—& that in this state of collision between the two Houses, brought abt. by the Minister, he, Ld. W., takes the initiative.

Now, as you know, some of our friends having in short words *rattled* once on the Catholic question, cannot afford to do so a 2nd time—& the gt. difficulty is for the moderate reformers to enlist such a force as shall give them any well-founded confidence of carrying a measure, which neither Peel or the Duke can approve except on compulsion as a choice between 2 evils.

This is a faint sketch of a variety of views entertained on the subject. I have not seen the D. of W. for three days; he is either giving audiences or on horseback, & yesterday went to the Hse. of Lords looking very well.

Ld. Ashley is very sulky & cross but will keep his seat. They are in a gt. mess abt. their foreign affairs, & in finance Goulburn moved for a return yesterday by which it will be seen that for 1831 there is a deficiency between the national income & Ld. Althorpe's estimate of 690,000—& giving Ld. A. credit for a blunder in the arrangement of his budget, a deficiency of *one* million £100,000. So much for Whig rule. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Lord Grenville had held the sinecure office of auditor of the exchequer since 1794. The question at issue was whether Great Britain should continue, now that Belgium was independent, to pay a share of the debt due to Russia by Holland, payable, according to the 1814 Treaty providing for the union of Holland and Belgium, so long as the union lasted. See *Parl. Deb.*, third series, ix. 903 (26 January 1832).

<sup>2</sup> Wharncliffe and Harrowby were the leaders of the *Waverers*, the tory peers who were prepared to accept a modified Reform Bill. They agreed to vote for the second reading provided the plan of creating peers was dropped and the bill amended in some respects.

## 162. The Marquess of Londonderry to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

Wynyard Park, 21 January 1832 — . . . The communication of the Duke to Strangford is admirable, *short, convincing, conclusive*. I can imagine no paper more irrefragable, if these deluded miscreants could be overcome by reason, but the truth is, all argument is vain. They have succeeded by delusion to entrap the country into *Reform* of some sort, and out of that supposed panacea for imaginary evils, I doubt if the country with the wisdom of a Socrates or the eloquence of Pitt can now be driven. The course of the opposers to this mania, in my opinion, should be consolidation & union, & system—inasmuch as the present *conservators* had so recently different lines of action, so is it most indispensable that confidence should be re-established between the leaders or the most prominent persons in each division of the party. The ultras are wide from the moderates, but yet unless they can amalgamate, no efficient Opposition can have existence. I have entirely disapproved of Wharnccliffe's late proceedings, because altho' a moderate Reformer, I think they have tended, since our rejection of the Bill last year,<sup>1</sup> to shew a more glaring separation in the Tory party, & I consider Wharnccliffe's stepping out of his natural line & position, from a mere impulse of vanity, believing he could lead the H. of Lords, & setting at nought all the mischief that the appearance of a split *must create*, has been quite unpardonable. It is from knowing that I shd. have given utterance to my feelings on this head, & probably have done mischief, that I did not go to town at the meeting. I learn today of a notice of motion as to Belgium,<sup>2</sup> & I think I shall run up for it in the mail, if I hear they mean to divide, which I shall know tomorrow. I have so long entertained the opinion that we are rul'd by a weak & imbecile Monarch that (assuming the worst) I have no reliance *there*. He has, in his own stupid reasoning & cunning, imagin'd that if he could act with the Whigs in office, he must have the Tories, from their natural connection with loyalty & the Church & the throne, & having sold himself to a reforming devil, when lost in his happy expedients (as above describ'd) he finds too late that he cannot emancipate himself from the shackles he has aided himself to create. The chances, therefore, are that by *driftlets* this foolish King will be overrul'd, & looking to this chance, *the worst issue* (which it is always politick to do) I say we ought to form a *nucleus* & establish a position, to which the country might again rally, supposing another reign, supposing revolution succeeded by anarchy & bloodshed, and supposing the majority of the country have their eyes open'd at the 11th hour. This may not be in our time, but the duty, in my mind, is not less imperative.

The idea of the Club<sup>3</sup> is admirable & should be anxiously & zealously work'd. Communication between those who were formerly *not allies* should be cherish'd & sought. In case of illness of our great leader, which, f[ro]m

<sup>1</sup> On 8 October (199 v. 158).

<sup>2</sup> See *Parl Deb.*, third series, ix 834, for Aberdeen's motion, criticising the government's policy with respect to Holland and Belgium. It was rejected by 132 to 95.

<sup>3</sup> The Carlton Club.

his late sufferings, might occur, a temporary business leader in the H. of Lords should be acknowledg'd & known. No party, circumstanced as we are to save the country dans l'avenir if not at the moment (when possibly the Empire may have gone through great convulsion) should entirely depend on one chief, who, from illness, we might not be able to call daily into action. Constant & unremitting exposure to the country of the faults of the Govt. should be the *daily bread* of the H. of Lords, & the desire of pursuing this course should be intimated by declaration of the D. in the Lords, & by direct letters to the Tory peers, begging their attendance. If we get a division or 2 now on other points (before Reform comes up) against the Govt. in the Lords, it would be of great moment in the country. I have no doubt a well organiz'd plan and a vigorous determination to *fight* & not parry & potter through the session as we did last year, might yet afford a chance: the only one we have, & the only mode I think of managing it.

The position of Reform is much as the Catholick question stood before it was carried. All admitted then that no Govt. could be fram'd or Cabinet form'd upon an exclusive system, & the Catholick Bill was an open measure in the Ministry. This must be the course in any new Government as to the details of Reform. But I disagree with Hardinge in thinking there wd. be any difficulty in the D. of W. or Peele taking the King's commands to form an Administration on a *moderate Reform principle*. The whole case has been made so different by the extreme madness of Lord Grey & his colleagues that to save us from the infernal regions everyone should unite to keep us on this side of the Styx, and as to *ratting*, really now-a-days there is so much & has been so much of this, that the argument does not hold good. . . .

### 163. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Stratfieldsaye, Sunday, 4 March 1832.*— . . . I feel very sensibly all you say, & how necessary it is that I shd. shake off my despondency. I do despond most dreadfully. I fear our country is gone. It may be the will of God that we shd. be punished, but the Government who have been the proximate causes of all our misery deserve the severest punishment. Between ourselves, but don't breathe it, I have little or no hope of throwing out the Bill in the Lords. Ld. Harrowby has done all he could to make converts, & he has succeeded to a frightful extent. Sir Herbert Taylor also has been writing to peers urging them to vote for the 2nd reading. All this I know, but I know it in secret, therefore pray don't mention it to anyone.

I must confess to you also that it breaks my heart to end my days in odium as a pensioner. This cuts me to the quick. I had made my own way in the world. What I got was got, I thought, honourably; & now to be turned round upon & to be considered the scum of the earth because I have been compensated for my services is more than I can bear. It causes me to hate showing myself anywhere. In short it horrifies me, & you don't know what anonymous letters I have had. In my younger days I cd. have borne up against it. Now it overwhelms me. But I will strive my best. I

do assure you it drives me out of society, & often makes me feel that the grave is my only refuge. But I will say no more about it. We must hope that better times will come. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, 10 March 1832.— . . . I attended a meeting of the new Club today. A committee was appointed; & it was intimated that we might have Ld. Kensington's house on Carlton Terrace. They say it will do remarkably well & I daresay we shall have it. 450 persons have signified their consent to belong to the club, & it is thought to be certain that out of 200 others written to we shall have at least 150.

I have not a word of news for you. The Govt. are in difficulties on every subject. Our West I. colonies are almost lost to us. It is thought that there is an end of Jamaica.<sup>1</sup> They say that the furious attacks on Ld. Grey in the Times have been written by Ld. Durham; & the Globe (Lord Grey's paper) calls those attacks *jealous & treacherous*. These words seem to be directed against some among themselves. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Woodford*, *Friday night*, 16 March 1832 — . . . Mrs Arbuthnot writes to me that Herries for the first time is cheerful. He tells her that the Govt. is lower & lower, & that even Jos. Hume says the Whigs have done more jobs & follies in one year than the Tories did in thirty. It is now, she adds, rather believed that Ld. Grey will not make peers & will go out if beaten on the 2nd reading. How glad you would be! Our new Club is prospering. We have already about 500 members. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, 12 April 1832.— . . . We were most triumphant last night in our speaking, as indeed we have been every night. The speech of Philpotts, Bp. of Exeter, was transcendant. It is said to have been beyond all praise. The Ministers are tottering I think. I know, *but do not breathe it*, that the King is getting sick of them, & is looking to their overthrow. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, *Saturday*, 14 April 1832 — We lost it,<sup>2</sup> as you will see, by 9—all owing to the Waverers. The debate quite astonishingly in our favour. The point now is to break it down in Comtee. & for this our whole party, ourselves, the ultra-Tories, & the Waverers must act well together. I trust this will be the case, but it is very difficult. We think we are sure that the King will not create peers; & a general notion prevails that the Govt. must break down, but don't be too sanguine. . . .

#### 164. The Earl of Aberdeen to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Priory*, 24 April 1832. *Private*.—I do not think that anything took place the other day at my house, which could give any cause whatever of uneasiness to the Duke. His wishes were attended to, and complied with, in the com-

<sup>1</sup> In 1831 a violent hurricane had destroyed a vast amount of property in Barbadoes, St. Vincent and St. Lucia, and in December a formidable negro insurrection in Jamaica caused widespread destruction of property. The West Indian planters, moreover, were organising opposition to the orders in council of November 1831 regulating the treatment of the slaves.

<sup>2</sup> The second reading of the Reform Bill was carried by 184 v. 175.

munication which it was proposed to make to those with whom we are to act. I was myself so unwell that I took very little part in the discussion, but I am certain that my impression is correct. We are to meet again on Monday. The truth is that there never was an occasion which so much required the exercise of sound judgement and discretion by the House of Lords. The principle of some Reform is carried by the second reading of the Bill; but the game I believe to be still in our hands, and the question is how to play it with success.

I observe you say that from the tone of the Duke's conversation, you imagine he is apprehensive that '*you, his friends*' may separate from him, and leave him to fight the battle with such of the Tories as may support him. At all events, I beg that you will separate *me* from *his friends* in this case, for most certainly this will not be my course. It has been my habit to defer to the Duke's judgement, even when most contrary to my own conviction; and although in one or two important cases the result has proved that I was wrong in so yielding, yet I am most ready to admit that every day has added fresh claims to the confidence which he has a right to expect. The Duke is too prudent and circumspect not to examine narrowly the new position in which he is placed by the change which the whole character of the question has received in consequence of the second reading of the Bill. His course will be decided from this view, and be it what it may, I cannot conceive it possible that any motive should induce me to deviate from it.

You mention Lyndhurst and Ellenborough. With the latter I have had but little communication, but I have no reason to think there is the least disposition to adopt any line of conduct which shall practically differ from that laid down by the Duke. With respect to the former, I shall be much surprised and disappointed if he is not found to be as cordial and efficient in his support of the Duke's views as it is possible for him to desire.

I have now answered your letter in the same open and confidential manner in which you have addressed me. Nothing would give me more pain than to think that your apprehensions were well founded; and I sincerely hope they will prove to have been entertained on insufficient grounds.

I recover but slowly. My breathing has been so much affected by the attack that the least exertion is painful; but I trust to be in better condition before the holidays are over.

#### 165. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Carlton Gardens, 8 May 1832* — . . . Our majority was much greater than we expected.<sup>1</sup> Unluckily Ld. Ellenborough made a speech afterwards wch did injury with the ultra-Tories, but he has seen Ld. Eldon, the D. of Cumberland, & Ld. Sidmouth, & they are all quite satisfied & cordial. The fact is Ld. Ellenborough went a great deal farther than the Duke would go,

<sup>1</sup> On the 7th the tory peers defeated the Reform Bill in committee on the question of postponing the disfranchising clauses, by 151 v. 116

& he ought not to have entered into any details at all; but all will be right. . . .<sup>1</sup>

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, 11 May 1832.—What will be done no one can as yet tell. The D. of Wellington wd. rather burn his hand off than not try to save the King, & he is ready to make the attempt, but that fatal dissolution of Pt.<sup>2</sup> has given us a H. of Cs. all powerful against us. However, be assured that the Duke will make every effort he can. . . .

It is ridiculous my giving military advice; but you may have risings, & I would just say that the Duke feels Paris was lost<sup>3</sup> by frittering away the troops in isolated small bodies. He wd. have kept the troops as much in one body as he could, & if it were necessary to divide the troops, he (the Duke) wd. always take care not to have a detachment so separated at a distance from the main body as not to be assisted when necessary.

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, 12 May 1832.— . . . The King is as stout as a lion. He says he wd. rather lay his head on the block than make the peers under any circumstances. . . .<sup>4</sup>

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, 15 May 1832.— . . . The game is up. Peel wd. not take office. The ultra-Tories in the Commons fell foul of the Duke. He cd. not get them to fill the Treasury Bench in the Commons; & he was forced to tell the King this morning that he cd. not form a Govt. The King had nothing to do but to send to Ld. Grey, & to try to make a compromise with him. I am broken hearted. . . .

#### 166. The Earl of Aberdeen to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Argyle House*, 17 May 1832. *Private*.—You will of course have received full information respecting the debate of tonight; but as you desired to hear from me, I perform my promise. Nothing could be better than the Duke's statement; indeed it was admirable; and I am happy to say that the manner and voice were particularly good. I am sure that it made a very deep impression on the House. I am so hoarse with cheering that I can scarcely speak. Lyndhurst was very good too. Mansfield made some good hits, and in his allusions to the Duke, some of which were beautiful, he was very happy; but on the whole, he was too long. Carnarvon as usual, was thorns and scorpions. I do not know that I ever heard in Parliament such a castigation as Ld. Grey received from him tonight.

The effect of the debate makes secession difficult, if not impossible. There is a spirit in the House which I think could not be brought to such a step; and I think that Lord Grey must be convinced of this. If he has the power,

<sup>1</sup> Ellenborough explained the amendments which he and his friends had intended to propose. He would have accepted Schedule A and the £10 borough qualification, retaining, however, the existing scot and lot boroughs.

<sup>2</sup> In April 1831, which gave the whigs a majority of about 140.

<sup>3</sup> In July 1830, when Charles X was deposed.

<sup>4</sup> On the 9th the government resigned after the king had refused to create a sufficient number of peers to enable the Reform Bill to be carried. Three days later the duke agreed to try to form a ministry.

therefore, we shall be swamped tomorrow, or he must again leave the King to seek other assistance. I am still assured that peers will not be made; but the letters from Taylor, one of which was nearly read in the House, look suspicious. The Duke of Richmond has been talked of, and I hear that Stanley says they are riding the King too hard in the matter of this creation of peers.

I shall call at Apsley House tomorrow morning, and perhaps may see you.

### 167. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Carlton Gardens, 21 May 1832.*— . . . It is quite impossible to make out what the King has promised or not promised. Poor wretched weak man he knows nothing of his situation.

The Ministers are in anything but a happy plight. They say (many of them do) that they can't last a month. Poulett Thompson told H. Baring an hour ago that they cd. not last three weeks. In the meanwhile the Radicals are increasing their power every day. The state of things is terrific. If they were again to resign, Peel wd. not take office. The Duke can't make a Treasury Bench in the H. of Commons. In short nothing can be well worse, short of actual revolution, & nothing but the Providence of God can save this ill-fated Empire. . . .

*Ibid., Carlton Gardens, 25 May 1832.*— . . . We may consider the Bill as good as passed. It breaks my heart to think of the destruction it prepares for the Monarchy. In the meanwhile the King has, now it is too late, opened his eyes, & he loathes Ld. Grey & his gang as much as he cd. desire. Their own language is that they cannot stay in many weeks, & they ground this upon the King's hostility. I saw a letter from [the] sister of one of the Cabinet Ministers to this effect. They will go out, but they will have left the King without the means of having any but Radical Ministers, for none but such will a Radical H. of Cs. support. It is too horrid. . . .

*Ibid., Carlton Gardens, 7 June 1832.*—I have not written to you for some days. The truth is, I have not had spirits to write. The wicked Bill being passed I consider the revolution as begun, & I find no one who don't think that we must see worse days before we can hope for better. I may expect to witness the worse days. At my age I cannot expect to see my country in prosperity again. It drives me frantic. We might have had a chance if Peel wd. have taken office. We have no chance now from any apparent human means, & we have no right to hope that Providence will interfere by a miracle in our favour.

That poor weak man the King is in high spirits, & thinks now that the Reform Bill being passed he may get rid of his present Ministers, being no longer pledged to them; but he does not recollect that by passing the Bill he has given the whole power to a fierce democracy ready to destroy him & all else with him.

I have not a single ray of hope to show you. I will say no more about it. . . .

## 168. Charles Arbuthnot to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Woodford, 17 June 1832.*— . . . I suppose we are to do nothing. I don't understand the policy of letting the enemy take all possible measures for the next election, & for us to look on. I suppose I am wrong, & that our chiefs are right. To me it is incomprehensible, & it is so unlike to what I was used, that among many other things it has sickened me of politics; but I will say no more about it. . . .

## 169. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Carlton Gardens, 25 June 1832.*—I write to you because I like to be in communication with you, but I have not one thing to tell you. I fear that neither the Duke nor Peel will exert themselves for the next elections. The Duke is out of sorts, & out of spirits, & seems to think that nothing can be done. When he had his great military difficulties he never thought so, but as one grows older one has less animation. His powers of mind are as great as ever, & I never saw him in better health, but he thinks the country is inevitably ruined. For Peel's conduct I don't pretend to account. I have not seen him [for] a very long time. Unless we have meetings, & concert, and subscriptions, the enemy will carry all before them. We are not in a way to have any one of those requisites. . . .

London is said to be very dull. I find it very *triste*, but I take our political state so to heart that I cannot enjoy anything. . . .

The Duke gives his Ball tomorrow. It was absolutely necessary he should invite the ministers to meet the King, & I shall hate seeing them.

*Ibid., Carlton Gardens, 27 June 1832.*— . . . I hear from everybody that the Duke was very much cheered in the mg. at the Review. There were a very few ruffians who hooted, but it was drowned in the great & general cheering.

There is a general notion that Ld. Grey will retire from the Govt. Not that the Govt. will be changed, but that on the plea of ill health he will put some one else at the head. A great scoundrel. He has lived long enough to destroy the British Empire.

*Ibid., Carlton Gardens, 3 July 1832.*— . . . The Duke of Wn. made one of the best speeches last night on the state of Ireland that was ever heard. Lord Mansfield said that he had never heard a finer speech. We cd. have beaten the Govt. but as we cd. not form another Govt. in the H. of Commons it wd. have been useless. The Duke went away without voting. . . .

*Ibid., Carlton Gardens, 5 July 1832.*— . . . The King wd. dismiss these men tomorrow if he were sure of being able to form another Govt., but with Peel's conduct we have nothing to do but to wait for events. I hope they will be out before the elections, for the next Parlt. will depend much upon our party being in or out of office. . . .

The cholera is very trifling in London, but it is very much spread in England. The great point is always to attend to the bowels, & if there is any beginning



of looseness to take a *tablespoonful* of *compound tincture* of rhubarb, do. of hot water—and 5 drops of laudanum. Go to bed, & repeat it in 4 hours. This Sir H. Halford recommends; & he says that if the bowels are attended to he feels confident that the bad cholera may be prevented. . . .

No one thing sells now, but we may be sure that this house is like a bank note as they say. If ever we have good times again, this house will sell capitally, but this year there has been no one single thing well sold. Bone's fine enamel pictures have been selling for a trifle. For 8 or 10 gs. pictures have been bought the other day wch. he had asked 200 for! Such is the result of the Reform. . . .

#### 170. William Holmes to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

10 Grafton Street, 10 September 1832 — . . . We are getting on much better with our elections than I ever expected. We shall have three for Essex, when we did not some time ago expect more than one. Sir Thomas Baring, I hear, retires from Hants, & I believe Fleming will come in for that County.<sup>1</sup> I have gone over the registration in Middlesex & I am confident if we got a good candidate, Hume would go out.<sup>2</sup> Lord Althorpe's friends are working hard in the Tower Hamlets for him & the contest will be between him and Dr Lushington, as the Tory candidate Mr Clay is quite secure.<sup>3</sup> Sir John Beckett has declined standing for for [*sic*] Hull, which I offered him. However I have got a good man to take up the ground. The deputation from that place is now in my house. I really cannot make out where Palmerston & Charles Grant are to come in for.<sup>4</sup> Hobhouse & all the Whig candidates are urging the Government to have a short session to amend the registry, but Lord Althorpe says nothing can be decided before the Cabinet meets about the middle of next month.

There is a packet expected this day from Portugal. We have no accounts or rumours respecting that place this day in town. Palmerston is the only Minister in town; neither of the Secretaries<sup>5</sup> or the Assistant Mr Stewart are at the Treasury. I really believe George Arbuthnot does all the business there now.

I cannot make out what Lord Lyndhurst is about. He sent his wife to Lowther where I believe she now is, & he came to town ten days ago, & left it about a week, but where he is gone his servants do not know. I had some idea that he & Brougham are in communication, of what kind I know not. Lord Lowther is gone to Italy for ten weeks. I heard the other day from Sir Robert Peel, who has a small party at Drayton, he did not say one word about politics, nor did he ask even a question about the elections, he merely asked me to go down there, which I declined in consequence of Lady Stronge's

<sup>1</sup> He did not.

<sup>2</sup> He was re-elected.

<sup>3</sup> Lushington and Clay were elected.

<sup>4</sup> For South Hampshire and Inverness-shire respectively

<sup>5</sup> Spring-Rice and Charles Wood.

continued sufferings from the tic doloreuse. She has laterly had some relief from having her head shaved & a belladonna plaister applied all over her head. . . .

I this morning received 22 letters on election business this morning [*sic*]. The Post Office treats me very civilly, as they do not charge any surplus vouchers now.

#### 171. John Wilson Croker to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*West Molesey, Surrey, 23 November* [1832]. Quite confidential & for you alone.—I want to consult you on a very delicate matter, at least so it appears to me. I have just seen for the first time, Mr Hook's *Life of Sir D. Baird*—of which I never saw a line before. I find in it the old story of the tope near Seringapatam, told, with, as it seems to me, no great kindness to the Duke. I am sure that Mr Hook admires & respects the Duke above all men, but somehow the story is told in a way that does not please me. Now, I have been asked to write or to get written an account of the book for the *Quarterly Review*, but I don't like to meddle with it. I should not like to notice the book without adverting to that part—it would have a bad effect; & on the other hand I cannot but think that the story might be better & more truly told. I am so satisfied of the correctness & delicacy of a lady's taste in such matters, & having moreover a special reliance in your good sense, I wish to ask you how the story strikes you, for if you have not seen the book, you must have seen that extract from it, which has been going the round of the newspapers. There are indeed two accounts, one in the text, by Mr Hook, from, it seems, Sir D. Baird's papers; the other in a note by Capt. Mackenzie—the Duke's companion on that occasion. The latter, which agrees with what I had before heard from Col. Shawe & others, appears to me the more favourable as well as the juster of the two; & if the book were reviewed, *that* might be quoted. But perhaps, after all, the best way will be that the *Quarterly* should not notice the work at all. Indeed it has greatly disappointed me & is but a poor performance for so clever a man.

I entreat you not to mention this note to anybody but Arbuthnot, & in your answer don't allow even his opinion to sway your own natural & candid judgement which is what I should rely on, & which I am therefore anxious to obtain.

This, I suppose, is nearly my last frank.<sup>1</sup>

#### 172. Lord Mahon to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Albemarle Street, Sunday evening, [25 November 1832].*— . . . There seems to be no doubt that the dissolution will take place immediately—either Saturday or Monday next. In the interval there will be busy doings at Hertford

<sup>1</sup> The book was not reviewed in the *Quarterly*, but the correct version of the incident is given in the *Quarterly's* review of Gurwood's *Wellington despatches*, 1799–1818, vol. I, in 1834 (ll. 405–8, where Hook's account is exhaustively examined).

—a great dinner to me & Ingestre on Wednesday—and I am sorry to say that my friends write me word that we ought to give another on Tuesday which will cost an additional £250. In fact, much as I have preached economy to my committee at Hertford, I fear that they are running riot & going to considerable expences; however I shall do all I possibly can to keep them within bounds. My friends are very sanguine of success, but so are the enemy on their side too, & I hear that Duncombe is offering bets on the subject at White's & Crockford's. *Nous verrons*. . . .<sup>1</sup>

### 173. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Woodford, Thursday, 29 November 1832.*— . . . I have been riding about the County to get a second candidate to Ld. Brudenell, & after the very greatest difficulties we have got one, & a good one—Mr. Tryon, living not far from Apethorpe, has agreed to stand; & everybody says that he is most popular. Henry Fane behaved remarkably well. He was most anxious to stand, & wd. have raised the money; but Ld. West[morland] wd. not agree to this, nor wd. he advance the money. Ld. Westd. wd. have been glad if the County wd. have brought his son in at its own expence . . . Ld. Brudenell & Mr. Tryon have coalesced, & confident hopes are entertained that both will succeed. I suppose that Ld. Milton will now start a 2nd candidate.<sup>2</sup> Sir G. Robinson has given up Northampton.<sup>3</sup> We hear that 2 Tories & 2 Whigs or Radicals are now started. C. Ross thinks himself, & is thought by others, secure. Perhaps Vernon Smith may now stand for the County. He is not popular.<sup>4</sup> From London I hear that our prospects in England & Ireland are good, but I fear that they are very bad in Scotland. I expect a letter from the D. of Buccleuch, & he will give me his opinion. Our attack on Holland is becoming more unpopular every day. One might have hoped that the King wd. have shown some spirit, but as yet he has not. From him I have little or no hopes. . . .<sup>5</sup>

*Ibid., Woodford, Sunday, 9 December 1832.*— . . . We can't as yet tell how the elections will turn out. We hope that the attack on Holland will help us generally; & there seems to be in our best informed an expectation that we shall be strong in the next Parlt.<sup>6</sup> Here we are sanguine, & fully expect to bring in both Ld. Brudenell & Mr. Tryon. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Lord Mahon and Viscount Ingestre were returned for Hertford.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Milton and Lord Brudenell were elected for Northamptonshire

<sup>3</sup> On account of ill health.

<sup>4</sup> Robert Vernon Smith (whig) and Charles Ross (conservative) were returned for Northampton.

<sup>5</sup> An English fleet was sent to blockade the Dutch coast, and a French army to attack the Dutch garrison in Antwerp, in order to coerce the King into acknowledging Belgian independence on the basis of the 24 Articles (14 October).

<sup>6</sup> Wellington was sanguine enough to hope that 'the country will be pretty equally divided between Tories on the one hand, and Whigs or government and Radicals, Unitarians, and Quakers and Jews, on the other' (*W.N.D.*, viii. 426).

## 174. The Earl of Rosslyn to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*St. James's Square, 22 December 1832.*—The result of the elections is indeed very unpleasant, but I have been so long used to opposition that I bear small minorities better than you all who have never been out of power except for short starts.<sup>1</sup>

I am less surprised & perhaps less annoyed by our failures than many others, for the first impression upon my own mind was to expect very nearly as much defeat as we have experienced ; but I could not resist the repeated assurances, & the very sanguine promises of success with which I was surrounded, & I ended at last by being bullied into the fool's paradise in which we have been living for the last six weeks. . . .

## 175. Mrs. Arbuthnot to Charles Arbuthnot.

[? 7 February 1833].— . . . I enclose you a note I had last night from Sir Rt. Wilson, which is my latest news, and the Duke, who came here from the King's dinner, thinks it likely to be true. I dare say they have patched it up for the moment, but no one can read the debates & imagine they can last *Everybody* I find are turning their minds & their hopes to a junction of Brougham & Stanley with the Duke, & certainly I think it our best hope. I am happy to see the D. is turning it in his head, & has quite made up his mind to it if he thinks such a junction could be made in a *creditable way & succeed*. He came here last night just as I had started for Ly. C. Powlett's. I saw his carriage & turned back. He staid till twelve o'clock, and told me all that was passing in his mind. He said he did not see that as far as *principles* went there wd. be much difficulty. Their coming to him wd. be a proof they wished to *conserve*, that *peace* wd. be both their objects abroad. He said he cd. not go without his friends ; I said of course they wd. not propose it, for they wd. want his friends as much as he did. He said he felt *bound* to all those who were willing to sacrifice themselves with him last May. That he did *not* consider himself in any degree bound to those who *wd. not* help him at that time. (He will never forget that). That he must consider Lds. Aberdeen, Ellenborough, Lyndhurst, Carnarvon, Rosslyn, Jersey, the D. of Buckingham, & of the Commons, Hardinge. But he did *not* feel that he was bound to think of Peel, Goulburn, Herries, Croker, or any of that set. Then he said there were Sugden, Wetherell, Sir G. Murray, Scarlett, all, in short, who stuck to him in May. I told him I thought that with regard to Peel &c. it was a question of *policy*, that there cd. be no doubt of the desirableness of having him, but I agreed with him he was not the least *bound* to them, & that he was to the others, but that I thought there wd. be plenty of room for them. He said that there wd. come the question of whether a Govt. cd. be carried on. Upon that point of course we cd. only speculate, but I am firmly of opinion it wd. be as strong as *any Govt.* can be now, & numbers wd. support it if once it was formed for the sake of a Govt. He appeared to

<sup>1</sup> The tories mustered only about 150 in the new house of commons.

speculate upon Stanley as Minister, & that it wd. be best for him to take *the Army*. I doubted about that. However we shall see whether these fellows break or not, you see another night has passed, & the debate <sup>1</sup> is again adjourned, not one Minister spoke, & the trash that was talked is enough to make a dog sick. You may suppose that while everybody is speculating upon these changes, pensions are not thought of. You may depend upon my taking good care of y[ou]r case in the event of its coming on on Tuesday, which I do not expect. . . .

#### 176. Sir Henry Hardinge to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Whitehall Pl[ace]*, 10 February 1833.—The Ministers have cut a sorry figure during the past week—& begin to admit they have purchased their power too dear. The only *two* speeches which powerfully vindicated the K[ing's] Speech were Peel's <sup>2</sup> & Shaw's <sup>3</sup>—of course the former's is much criticised. With the knowledge of two parties in the Cabinet, & considering the violent conduct of the Revolutionary Party, it was, in my judgement, very desirable when the debate had become Irish, to load the Govt. with the heavy responsibility of proving to the country that they were not forced by our factious opposition to proceed with the *Mouvement*.<sup>4</sup> It has I think fixed them in open warfare with the Radical Party, & before another month expires, we shall have the pleasure of finding them detested by the people out of doors, for gagging Ireland & its grievances—refusing to take off the assessed taxes—no diminution of expenditure—refusal to vote by ballot or to shorten Parls.—& many other difficulties, which Hume & O'Connell & Cobbett will fasten upon them in the eye of the public. Feeble on the Treasury benches, disappointing the expectations of the people out of doors, & worried to death by the Irish demagogues, I do not think they can last through the session.

Palmerston is ruined in reputation; the only point which we could not assent to in the Speech, was the past conduct of the Govt. in foreign affairs—& he, the F[oreign] Minister, leaves the vindication of his Dept. to Dr. Lushington—who has declared for ballot.<sup>5</sup> I wd. not vote last night for the Address on acct. of the very able & proper limitation by the Duke disapproving of this part of the Address, but had I spoken I should of course have done as Peel has. I am most anxious that *we* should not be considered an appendage to this rascally Govt.—& so is Peel, as you will find on the foreign policy whenever it is discussed,—but I am satisfied he & Stanley will come together, by the virulence with which the latter is openly attacked by his enemies & secretly intrigued agt. by his friends. When the schism takes place, many Whigs will enlist under Peel in our Hse. as they are anxious to do in the Lords under the Duke. In short, the Govt. is in a most painful condition.

They intend to *pay* the Catholic clergy but not out of Protestant Church

<sup>1</sup> On the Address in answer to the King's Speech at the opening of the first session of the Reformed Parliament

<sup>2</sup> On the 7th (*Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, xv. 366).

<sup>3</sup> On the 8th (*ibid.*, xv. 435).

<sup>4</sup> For radical reform

<sup>5</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, xv. 425 (8 February).

funds—the Church cess howr., will, I hear, come out of Church funds, not exceeding 15 pr ct. As to Corn Laws we shall be spared the annoyance of hearing Lord Milton on the subject—his father's death having translated him to the Upper Hse., where I hope he will be less mischievous.

The Duke made an excellent exposé of the Dutch & Portugse. questions. . . .<sup>1</sup>

### 177. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Carlton Gardens, 9 March 1833.*— . . I believe it is certain that all the Ministers with the exception of Brougham & Stanley had resigned; at least the King said so, & the Ministers I understand are furious with him for blabbing out the secret. They have patched up their Govt for the present, but it is imagined that they cannot last. Ld. Althorp is felt by everyone to be ridiculously inefficient, & Hume said to Hardinge the other night that instead of speaking with more facility, he hammered & stammered worse & worse.

I believe that had Ireland been quiet there wd. have been no breach between the Govt. & the Radicals, but the quarrel is now complete. Still I fear that if these men stay in they will yield every day to the popular & mob cry, & that thus we shall be ruined in detail. I don't see how with this H. of Cs. any men can govern, but yet I wd. rather see the present men out, as they are sure to do mischief.

Everybody says that Peel's speech<sup>2</sup> was magnificent & by far the best he ever made. . . .

*Ibid., Stratfieldsaye, 15 March 1833.*— . . I am assured that the intention was to prevent Ld. Anglesey's going back, but that he remonstrated loudly, telling Ld. Grey that he had been instrumental in making him Minister, (which is true I believe) & that the sacrificing & destroying him was the return he met with. It was, I understand, in consequence of this remonstrance that he was allowed to go back, tho' Stanley has declared that unless the Ld. Lt. was changed, there was no chance of pacifying Ireland. Ld. Anglesey was sent because the D. of Wn. had recalled him, & now he is kept because they have not courage to get rid of him. . . .<sup>3</sup>

One cannot but hope that the country will be disgusted with the proceedings & debates in the reformed H. of Cs.; & if this shd. happen it might give us the best chance of a reaction. As yet we have not much symptom of men coming to their senses. The elections in the City of London & at Dover are rather good signs, & I find that hopes are entertained of getting in Mr. Hope for Marylebone. . . .<sup>4</sup>

It is quite terrible how all our friends croak. It is very disagreeable also, & makes London quite odious. Between ourselves, no one is worse than

<sup>1</sup> *Parl. Deb*, 3rd series, xv 123 (5 February)

<sup>2</sup> In support of the Irish Coercion Bill, 1 March (*Parl. Deb*, 3rd series, xvi. 77)

<sup>3</sup> He was succeeded as lord-lieutenant in September by Lord Wellesley. For Brougham's efforts in December 1832 to secure Anglesey's removal and Stanley's promotion to some other office, see Brougham's *Memoirs*, iii 235 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> Sir Samuel Burden Whalley was returned at the by-election in March.

the Duke. To hear him, there is not a hope of our being saved from revolution. I trust he is wrong: but wrong or right, the hearing from morn till night that we are going fast the way the French went 40 yrs. ago is very painful, & it makes me very much wish to live at Woodford. You have no idea how detestable London is. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, 26 March 1833.— . . . The Conservative Club is always full, & flourishes greatly. Many dinners there. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, 2 April 1833.— . . . The following is a fact. Stanley declared that he wd. not return to Ireland to be with Ld. Anglesey, that he did not want to be in office, but that if he were, he cd. not be less than Secy. of State. Ld. Grey asked Ld. Goderich to take the P. Seal. He refused, but offered to retire. On this Ld. Melbourne & Ld. Palmerston said that they wd. quit too if Ld. Goderich did. Then Ld. Grey went to Ld. Goderich again, saying that the Govt. must break up unless he consented. Upon this he gave [way], stipulating however for an Earldom & the Garter ! ! ! ! This no report, it is the truth.<sup>1</sup>

#### 178. Lord Mahon to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Albemarle Street*, 5 April 1833.— . . . I will not attempt to conceal that I feel my exclusion from Parliament & public life very painfully, & that I find a melancholy void in all my chief objects of pursuit. The large sum I have spent only to be unseated at last, is another disagreeable reflection, & one more may be found in the party-bias of the tribunal which tried me, & the glaring injustice of their sentence.<sup>2</sup>

I have no prospect of any other place, & have not yet determined what I shall do with myself. Meanwhile the small remains of patience which the Election Committee had left me were scattered yesterday by another annoyance. Do you remember my article on Lord John Russell & the French Revolution which I showed you in the proofs? Well, on receiving yesterday an early copy of the *Quarterly* I perceived that Croker has been taking my article & so completely altering & new-modelling it that I hardly knew it again.<sup>3</sup> He has made it now very personal & scurrilous about Lord John, calling his book for instance 'an impudent catch-penny!',<sup>4</sup> suppressed & garbled many of my ideas & in short so thoroughly altered the whole thing that I now utterly disclaim it as mine, & shall be obliged in justice to myself to publish my paper separately in its original state. Only think how vexatious! Pray don't fail

<sup>1</sup> Stanley was now removed from the Irish secretaryship and given Goderich's office of colonial secretary, Goderich became lord privy seal. The story is differently told by Greville (*Memoirs*, 29 March 1833. See also *Croker papers*, ii 208, and Brougham's *Memoirs*, iii. 379).

<sup>2</sup> He had been elected for Hertford on 12 December 1832, but was unseated on the petition of T. S. Duncombe and J. E. Spalding. The election committee found that bribery had been extensively practised, but though the election was declared void, the speaker never issued a new writ for another election during the lifetime of this Parliament. Lord Mahon was again returned for Hertford at the general election in January 1835.

<sup>3</sup> *Quarterly Review*, April 1833, pp. 152-74

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 153.

if ever you hear the subject mentioned, to explain that I disavow entirely this garbled production—& excuse me for thus inflicting all my *Jeremiades* upon you.

179. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Drayton House, 9 April 1833.*— . . . I tell you in gt. confidence that Ld. Grey wants to give up flogging, & has desired Ld. Hill to consult the Duke & to urge him to give way. *Pray don't breathe this.* The Duke will not give way; but I fear it will be given up, & if so, the army is gone. . . .<sup>1</sup>

*Ibid., Carlton Gardens, 23 April 1833.*— . . . We are hoping that the Government is rather more conservative. We always, however, dread the worst, for we have generally seen that an indication to be conservative has been followed by attempts to regain the Radicals. On no subject are we more alarmed than on that of corporal punishment in the army. You know that perhaps to a fault & to weakness I have a horror of ever inflicting it, but I am confident that without the power the discipline of the army is gone. The Duke of Wn. has been in communication with the King about it,<sup>2</sup> & we have reason to believe that even Lord Grey himself sees the necessity of preserving the power; but one can have no confidence in Mr. Ellice,<sup>3</sup> & most unfortunately Sir Hussey<sup>4</sup> is quoted as being of opinion that corporal punishment may be given up. I have on more accounts than one been sorry that Sir Hussey has given this opinion. Sir Henry Fane says that the army is gone if the power is taken away. The Duke says that he wd. rather the whole army was disbanded than see it in a state of mutiny, which he is confident will be the case if the terror of corporal punishment cannot be held over the soldiers. . . .

180. Charles Arbuthnot to Colonel Stopford.

*Carlton Gardens, 30 April 1833. Copy.*—The communication you have made to me has surprised me as much as it did you. I observe that Mr. Maunsel has advised Mr. Tryon to apply to his *guarantee*. It is right I shd. tell you what passed when Mr. Tryon was urged to stand by Lord Exeter & myself. Mr Tryon said that he could not bear any part of the contest himself. Ld. Exeter & I told him that he wd. not be so called upon, & subsequently he desired to have this stated to him in writing. Ld. Exeter observed to me that, he being a peer, it wd. not be proper for him to write this, & therefore I did.

Now let me remark what part I personally took, & what subsequently passed. Mr. Berkeley had declared that the expence cd. not exceed £3,500,

<sup>1</sup> The question was raised in the commons on 2 April, Joseph Hume's motion to abolish military flogging being defeated by 151 to 140, the government opposing it

<sup>2</sup> Wellington never believed that flogging could safely be dispensed with. See Maxwell's *Wellington*, ii. 130.

<sup>3</sup> Who had just become secretary at war

<sup>4</sup> Lieutenant-General Sir Richard Hussey Vivian, commander of the forces in Ireland; his daughter Charlotte married Arbuthnot's son Charles on 14 August 1833.



& that he wd., upon being given £4000, guarantee the entire expence. You heard him say the same. Upon my application the D. of Buccleugh subscribed £2,000, Ld. Exeter £1000, Ld. Westd. £500 This was the whole sum which Mr. Berkeley had said wd. be required, at once raised. I will say nothing of my own subscription, except that it was as much as I cd. afford. There were subscriptions from many other gentlemen; but until the other day, when the amount was communicated to me, I was ignorant of the amount. A committee was appointed at a meeting, which, from illness, I cd. not attend. Germain thinks that I was named to the committee. It was never notified to me, & at this moment I know not whether I was named. I knew nothing of what was done to controul expences. I know not at this hour what was done for that purpose. If I had been looked to as *one of the guarantees* to bear expences beyond the subscription, I of course shd. have been told what expences it was contemplated to sanction. It must be well known to everyone concerned that nothing of this kind took place

The above is a statement of facts. On this statement I make no comment. Had I been so absurd as to have thought of bearing the expence of Mr. Tryon's contest, I must in common sense have stipulated that no expence was incurred without my sanction.<sup>1</sup>

#### 181. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Carlton Gardens, 11 June 1833.*— . . . I am rather irritated at present, as the Govt. have allowed a Comtee. on the Woods & Forests office,<sup>2</sup> & they permit that blackguard Mr. Whittle Harvey to move a resolution of censure on me for what I did when I was at the head of the dept.

What I did was this The Treasury thought proper to advance money for building the D. of York's house, & they ordered me (or rather they ordered the Board of wch. I was the chief) to pay that money. Ld. Liverpool was First Lord of the Treasury, & Ld. Ripon (then Mr. Robinson) was Chancr. of the Exr.

They must have gone out of their way in the Comtee. to censure me, as I did no more than obey the Treasury, which I was bound to do, & which indeed I could not refuse doing. You see, however, how glad they wd. be to injure me; & most certainly it does irritate me. I suppose I shall be abused in the H. of Cs.; & I have no doubt the next ground of abuse will be the pension. It really makes life a burthen. . . .

*Ibid, Carlton Gardens, 14 June 1833.*— . . . I fear that the Govt. will get thro' this session. I wd. rather they were in till they had proved to the whole world their incapacity, but in the meantime they destroy all our institutions & all our interests one after another. But with such a H. of Cs. as the present we cd. not carry a vote even if they were turned out. They expect us to beat them in the Lords on the Irish Church Robbery Bill, & they therefore do not mean to vote their remaining estimates until that Bill shall have passed

<sup>1</sup> See Nos. 173, 173A

<sup>2</sup> *Parl Deb*, 3rd series, xvii. 1027 (7 May).

both Houses.<sup>1</sup> They feel that if all the money for the year was voted, & they were then turned out, we shd. have 6 or 7 months of quiet recess, & that Pt. might be dissolved for us to try our chance at another general election.

The people abhor the Whigs. I fear they are not yet come back to us. . .

**182. Charles Arbuthnot to Mrs. Arbuthnot.**

*Bedford, 9 July 1833.*— . . . Our political state hangs heavy on my mind. The last talk with the Duke depressed & oppressed me. He certainly is Job's comforter. In talking to us he don't do harm—to others it does. . . .

**183. The Earl of Rosslyn to Mrs. Arbuthnot.**

*St. Ja[m]es's Sq[ua]re, 20 July 1833.*—You will see by the papers that out ultra friends divided much stronger last night than we had anticipated. They voted in all 98.<sup>2</sup> The Duke & many of his immediate friends did not vote. The Duke spoke well & with great force against the measures of the Government.<sup>3</sup> The Bishop of Exeter on the second night made a most powerful speech, which for the first two hours & a half was most excellent & most effective; but the last two hours were all too much irrelevant & in a great degree tiresome.<sup>4</sup>

I have been occupied every moment since I was up, partly at Apsley House during the discussion of the amendment, & partly in correcting & arranging our lists for the Committee. I am sorry to say some of our friends are gone away & some will not come up. Many of our ultras are in mortal ill humor with all that passed last night, & swear they will not attend the Committee, but I think they will come round, & the D. of Cumberland will take the credit of bringing them to. The Duke of Newcastle was *most unreasonably* offended at the Duke's speech, & Winchilsea was furious at the check he received respecting the King's letter to the Bishops<sup>5</sup>—an adventure upon which he was evidently driven by H. R. Highness.

With all these follies & intrigues it is not easy to estimate our force in the Committee, where a few desertions would lead to our defeat. . . .

**184. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.**

*Woodford, Monday, 22 July 1833.*— . . . I feel that we are at this moment in a great crisis. In my opinion it was quite right not to divide on the 2nd reading, not because I have not a horror of the Bill, but because the Primate

<sup>1</sup> The Irish Church Bill, which became law, suppressed ten of the 22 Irish Bishoprics, abolished the church cess (or rate), replacing it by a tax on all benefices of over £200 a year ranging from 5 to 15 per cent, and empowered an ecclesiastical commission to suspend the appointment of an incumbent or curate in parishes where no religious service had been performed for three years.

<sup>2</sup> The Irish Church Bill was read a second time by 157 to 98.

<sup>3</sup> *Parl Deb*, 3rd series, xix 948.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, xix. 809 (18 July)

\* <sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, xix 916 The bishop of London denied that the king had written anything on the subject of the Irish Church Bill which infringed on the privileges of the house.

had most strangely committed himself on it to Mr. Stanley, & because the throwing it out altogether would have rallied all the Dissenters, Free-thinkers, Radicals &c. against us; but if I had the local information which you now have, I should still consider this measure as most dangerous, & for the plain reason that if one species of property is attacked, no other species can be secure. You may have seen in the Bishop of Exeter's speech that the property of the Bishops was acquired precisely as *Ld. Lansdowne's* estates were, & if the former may be robbed there is no reason why the latter may not also—and I must add that religiously & politically I look with anxiety to the spreading of Protestantism in Ireland, but plunder & oppression will not effect this. I feel therefore that even from these Ministers no such wicked measure has emanated as this Robbery Bill, & let what may be the consequence, I earnestly hope that it may be greatly altered in Committee. I will not pretend to say whether we can form a Govt. or not. I am very sure that this is a question wch. no man can resolve until the necessity shall arise, & if, as I hear, numbers now support this Govt. from fear of dissolution, it is not improbable that we might be supported if it were seen that we shd. not dissolve. . . .

I shall be very sorry if you do not belong to the U[nited] S[ervice] Club. It is true that I aided & perhaps got for you all yr. promotion, but you got for yrself the character you have in yr. profession, & were I you I shd. look wholly & solely to that profession. I never see the Duke in roaring spirits but when his old military associates are around him, & it is yr. military associates whom I wd. have you cultivate. They will be yr. best friends & yr. best supporters, & I shd. be grieved if you slighted them by refusing to belong to them. I *have* taken my name out of White's, wch is now *Ld. Sefton's* Club, & were I you I wd. do the same. . . .

#### 185. The Earl of Rosslyn to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*St. James's Square, 24 July 1833.*—I hardly know how to give you any intelligible account of the details of our conduct & position. The Duke has certainly conducted himself generally with great temper & forbearance; but his situation is extremely trying and difficult. The Dukes of Cumberland & Buckingham are constantly carrying on an intrigue against him; the object of which is apparently to compell him to take some measure the result of which will be the rejection or abandonment of the Bill, & the resignation of the Government; & the incessant annoyance & irritation which is played off against him as well at home as by deputations & even in the House of Lords when sitting next to him, is nearly enough to get the better of the most patient temper.

He bears it, however, far better than I could have hoped, altho' sometimes he is driven to say to each of the Princes respectively that they must take their own course but that he must be left to manage his own business.

We had a division last night, in which we were beaten.<sup>1</sup> The Duke had proposed that the Bishopricks to be suppressed should be united to those

<sup>1</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, xix. 1084-1104. The numbers were 90 v. 76.

to be retained by the King's prerogative & not by Act of Parliament. The Chancellor at first partly came into it, but at last he & Grey opposed it *à tout ou trance*, & declared that it would destroy the efficiency of the Bill. The Duke, unwilling to hazard the consequences, was disposed to give up or rather modify the amendment. Our friends & even some of the reasonable ones shewed great dissatisfaction, & the Duke agreed to divide, the Ministers having refused to give any facility for making the modification to which he would have submitted. This was fortunate, for the division reconciled many of our friends, & happily we were beaten, several of our friends not voting. I went to the division with the less anxiety that I was pretty confident we were in a minority.

How we may get on tonight, I know not, but the Duke will not throw out the Bill on the Report or 3d reading. In the House of Commons the Ministers were for some hours in a decided minority upon Tennyson's motion for triennial Parliaments; <sup>1</sup> and they were at last only saved by Peel's going down; & by all the exertions that a personal canvass by Holmes (after 9 o'clock) could effect. You may therefore judge, from this sample, of the chance of managing this House of Commons. I am only anxious to keep our own immediate friends safe & satisfied; & I can make up my mind to seeing the Princes (who by the by don't draw together) take a separate course of their own, if they like it. It is manifest that neither the Duke nor Peel can desire to overthrow this Ministry without being prepared if necessary to form a new one; and for one I am persuaded that the project is altogether wild & impracticable; & I believe that both the Duke & Peel agree in that opinion, in the present state of things. We shall fight the clause suspending livings where there has been no service for three years; which appears to be the only point upon which we can make a real stand. The Duke has made a dinner for our Scotchmen who come 600 miles to vote; & others who have made similar tho' smaller exertions.

Upon the whole I am neither out of spirits nor much discomposed by all that is going on. I must, however, confess that all I see & hear goes to confirm my apprehension of the probable approach of revolution, and at no very slow pace.

*Ibid.*, St. James's Square, 27 July 1833.— . . . I hear that the ultras have determined to offer the command of their mutinous little troop to Lyndhurst if the Duke does not vote agt. the 3d reading,<sup>2</sup> & have been signing a paper to that effect. They will meet with no encouragement in that quarter; & the Duke will now be delivered from the endless annoyance of all their intrigues & incessant persecution. He will be at liberty to follow his own judgment, & will be ultimately neither less strong nor in any way damaged.

The Duke's line has been most wise & judicious, & places him in a most advantageous position with the people. The Duke will have told you all that has passed on this subject, & I add only the report given of the proceedings of the D. of Cumberland & Buckingham.

<sup>1</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, xix 1107-50. The motion was defeated by 213 to 164.

<sup>2</sup> He did not. The third reading was carried on the 30th by 135 to 81.

I hear the Cabinet divided upon going out yesterday 9 for staying to 5 for going. It is said Grey, Stanley & Richmond are in the first, & Brougham & Johnny Russell in the last with Althorp.

*Ibid.*, *St. James's Square, 5 August 1833*.—I always consider your letters as confidential, & on the subject of the last, I should hold it to be peculiarly so. I must say in answer to it that you appear to have received a very exaggerated version of the whole transaction. I believe I was present at all the meetings, two of which were in my house, & the rest at Apsley House, & I certainly did not witness anything that could be called a scene. It is true that the tone of the conversation was very disagreeable, & gave great offence to the Duke. But the thing that he most resented was that the ultra Lords had always previous meetings held apart on the same days when they were invited to Apsley House; & some of them came there as *deputies* from a distinct body. During all these discussions the Duke admitted fully their right to follow their own line, & distinctly stated his, but not in a way to give any just cause of offence. I believe that afterwards there was an interview with the Duke of Buckingham at which I was not present, when the Duke distinctly intimated that he would not be any longer considered as the head of the party. He said that he could not see the possibility of forming a new Government; & that, indeed, being satisfied from the proceedings held towards him that he did not possess the confidence of those in whose name the Duke of B. spoke, he must say he could repose no confidence in them. That if the King did ever send for him, he must as an honest man tell H. Majy. that he had not the confidence & support of those peers in the House of Lords, nor could he trust them.

He had before said in the course of these conversations that he would not take the Government without being prepared to lay his head upon the block.

With respect to the complaint made against him of attacking the D. of Newcastle in the House of Lords, I must say that it went no farther than a fair & reasonable answer to his argument—and it is too much to expect that they should be permitted to make strong & repeated attacks upon the Catholic Relief Bill, & the Duke as its author & the cause of every mischief, & that, night after night, without drawing forth a sharp answer (the Duke having borne it all quietly) and that they should take the pet & run sulky upon an observation which was neither personal nor offensive. You will collect from this that I cannot blame the Duke of W., or think his conduct has been otherwise than conciliatory, as long as there was any hope of keeping terms with them or holding the party together—and that tho' he felt deeply the sort of indignity offered to him by all the intrigues they were carrying on against him, by the pains to enlist his own friends against him, & the tone of the deputations, he did not break out at any meeting. I am satisfied that if I could detail all that has passed, you would approve the whole of the Duke's conduct.

It is certainly much to be regretted that there has been any split, & that the party appears for the present to be broken up; but I am very confident

that a very large proportion of the best of our Lords will adhere to the Duke, & that even a great many of those who voted against the 3 reading of the Irish Church Bill even now look up to him & will follow him as steadily & faithfully as ever. The ultras will be sulky & perhaps abusive, but when the time comes when exertions are to be made with any prospects of ultimate success, the greater part will come in.

At all events the Duke of Buckingham was hardly to be endured, & I am very much deceived in my estimate of his Grace's character if the manner in which he has been dealt with be not the course most likely to bring him into order by & by.

I have been led into more length than I intended, & perhaps have repeated more than I ought, but I could not bear to leave you under a false & painful impression upon a matter so interesting to your feelings. I am not dispirited or much annoyed by what has happened.

I have seen the storm gathering, have watched the progress of it, & have long foreseen the crisis, which, tho' I said nothing to anybody, was evidently impending. I don't believe that this little breeze will affect the chances of forming a new Government if that ever becomes practicable, or impede it. I have written in great haste & I only add, you may rely upon my discretion & caution in regard to the confidence we must mutually repose in each other, when we correspond upon subjects of such delicacy.

#### 186. The Earl of Rosslyn to Charles Arbuthnot.

*St. James's Square, 6 August 1833.*— . . . I am sure the Duke's mind & temper are greatly relieved by the end of all the irritation & intrigue from which he has been suffering. I have no doubt that most of the ultra Lords will come round, & most particularly all who are anxious to get into office, for plunge or grundle how they may, they cannot hope to be Ministers exclusive of the Duke & Peel. I feel confident that if you were in town & *au courant* of all that has passed from day to day, you would cheer up & be anything but heart-broken.

The worst thing in our present state is the necessity of seeking for a subscription to pay our old debts of Charles St. & our current expenses. The sum of both unpaid is nearly £960. Ross engages to collect £200 for the current year, which reduces the amount to £760—I will subscribe £50, which is at least my full proportion. The Duke & Peel must come down, & the Duke apply to others for sum of 100 or 50. If you have any remnants of your fund left, it will greatly assist & relieve him, for he dislikes the duty of tax gatherer most exceedingly. I told him I would write to you on the subject.

#### 187. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Woodford, Tuesday, 20 August 1833.*— . . . If this Government should last, no remnant of our Constitution will last; & I see no chance of getting rid of it. I am sure it might have been done if we had had Mr. Pitt, Mr.

Perceval, or Lord Londonderry in the House of Commons ; but we have no one there who has the greatness of mind which these awful times require. It broke the Duke of Wellington's heart not to throw out the Church Robbery Bill, but with such a Party as we have in the H. of Commons, he felt that the risk wd. have been too great. I will say no more about it. The whole subject so sickens me that I never by any chance read one word of the debates, & until Parlt. is prorogued I shall abstain from looking at the papers. . . .

#### 188. Sir Henry Hardinge to the Duke of Wellington.

*Carlton Club, Monday [11 November 1833].*—I found the inclosed note from Sugden who was at the Lord Mayor's dinner.<sup>1</sup> Popular applause is not a very substantial article—but on this occasion it may serve to show in which quarter the wind is blowing—and also to prove that on every occasion your friends are most anxious where your Grace is in question. I hear from other quarters that the Ministers do not conceal their mortification. Peel, I hear, will be in town *in a fortnight*, & remain *about* a fortnight. My informant is Grant, who came up with Croker this morning.

#### 189. Edward B. Sugden to Sir Henry Hardinge.

*Westminster, 11 November [1833]*—As I know it will give you pleasure I am going to give you an account of the Guildhall Dinner. Brougham's health was given by itself. He made a very neat speech well calculated to suit his hearers, but it failed miserably, & I should think that his health & his speech were never before received so badly in a popular assembly. 'His Majesty's Ministers', 'Lord Althorp' &c. fared even worse. It was absolutely ludicrous to me to hear the Toast-master in his finery giving the 'hips' and the 'hurra's' in a voice of thunder, & *no one human being* joining in the cheer. Entire tables-full of persons sat motionless when these toasts were given and the speeches made. Now for the contrast. 'The Duke of Wellington' was electrical. As I cannot represent a thousand people animated to enthusiasm by one overpowering sentiment—all standing up, cheering, waving hats, striking, knocking, hurra-ing, cuppling of hands—to testify their approbation—and all this renewed over & over again as it seemed to be dying on the ear, as I cannot paint the delighted looks of such eager animated applauders—I cannot give you more than a faint notion of the manner in which the Duke's health was received. A higher popular tribute of applause & affection no man in his absence ever received from so vast an assembly. That his Majesty's Ministers drank of the cup to the very dregs you may be assured.

#### 190. Sir Henry Hardinge to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Monday, [11 November 1833].*—Whilst you continue in the country, I shall from time to time send you a bulletin of the *on dit's* of the town—with one

<sup>1</sup> The Right Hon. C. Farebrother was the newly-elected lord mayor of London.

proviso, that you need never answer my letters, unless on a rainy day you have nothing better to do.

I hear the Ministers are in dugdeon [*sic*] with Ld. Durham, & I should imagine that must be the case for his offence was grave & the Ministerial papers have not been instructed to defend him from the attacks of the Post, which for the last week has risen 100 pr ct. since Praed took it in hand.<sup>1</sup>

Ellice is trying to get into the Cabinet—Brougham, Lansdowne, Richmond, Stanley are said to be opposed to it. We are therefore attacking *his name* thro' his brother the Genl. who never held any higher regtal. rank than Major & never commanded a regt. in his life. I furnished the mischief from undoubted authority. The *Times* & the *Post* between them may marr his prospects, but of the intention up to the beginning of last week there can be no doubt. We shall give the said Edd. Ellice a slap in a day or two, & do as much mischief as we can, but the Press has nearly spent its force, & the Tory Press never can be powerful except with the intelligence and property of the country, & those elements of Government no longer rule the destinies of our country.

Littleton has damaged himself *pretty considerably*, as Matthews wd. say—we shall not let him alone.

In the mily. line, I have given 4 or 5 articles to Hook from the Comers' report & that of the Duke's disinterestedness in being the first Constable who refused £300 for each Warder appointed—but Theodore is so idle & nonchalant that I rather think we must unite all our forces & make the Post important.

The popularity of the Duke had a most triumphant display at the Ld. Mayor's on Saturday—the Ministers being present—I had my story from Sugden who was present & I have begged him to write me a note which I intend to send to the Duke, for nothing does public men so much good as the feeling that their fame is cherished by their friends & party—altho' no man ought to despise popular shouts, more than the hero who has on the gt. anniversary of Waterloo & in the City of London, been hissed & almost assassinated.

Howr. the assembly at the Guildhall consisted of respectable citizens. Now for Sugden's acct. . . .<sup>2</sup>

I hear Stanley looked pale & sad—if they have consciences they must know that they deserve to be gibbeted for their crimes in destroying the Monarchy—for if they become as unpopular as they deserve, & throw up in alarm, avowing their incapacity to carry on the Govt., I do not think, constituted as the Hse. of Coms. is, that any Govt. could last a year. In short, no King's Govt. can hereafter be found. . . .

#### 191. Lord Mahon to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*Wycombe Abbey, 17 November 1833.*— . . . I will tell you in great confidence, that when I was last in town, Hardinge told me he thought it of great importance that our publications should warn the more moderate party in

<sup>1</sup> For these tory newspaper attacks on Durham, see Chester New's *Durham*, p. 233.

<sup>2</sup> See No 189.



the Cabinet of the dangers they would incur both to themselves & to the country should they ever again coalesce with Lord Durham, & he requested me to write an article on the subject. Accordingly I sent him one which he has had inserted, & which I inclose for your perusal. . . .

#### 192. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Woodford, 14 January 1834.*— . . . I wish I could avoid thinking of the approaching session. The revenue falls off, I see, & I think that property of all kind will be attacked. I feel sure that much will pass about the pensions. To be so abused for what the King had a right to give, & for wch. I passed a long life of hard labour, is hard & unjust. I read in some of the memoirs of the French Revolution the account given by a man who narrowly escaped being guillotined, & he called it 'Son agonie de 36 heures'. Mine has been 'Une agonie de 36 mois', for I have never for the last 3 years had any peace. But I must bear it as well as I can. I only know that could I afford to give up the pensions I would tomorrow, for they are my misery. I wonder whether you ever hear the subject named. Hume told *Chin*<sup>1</sup> that he shd. make a motion wch. could not be resisted. I used to think that the country would weather the storm, but I begin to doubt it. The projected attack on the Church &c. &c. &c. are enough to appal any man. . . .

#### 193. Charles Arbuthnot to Lord Stuart de Rothesay.

*Stratfield Saye, 19 January 1834. Copy.*— . . . I shd. not speak the truth if I did not own that the attacks are very painful to me. My long experience tells me that where there are attacks, many will be unjust, & will feel that there is ground for them. I believe therefore that when they are made it wd. be better to have the real case known, tho' I confess that I wd. far rather be left at peace; for having done with political life, I might have hoped to pass the remainder of my days in tranquillity. Mrs. Arbuthnot is fortunately more stoical, & treats the attacks with sovereign contempt.

The case of the pension is this. In 1807 I received my diplomatic pension, but early in 1809 it was suspended from my taking office. In 1823 I quitted the Treasury & was appointed to the Woods & Forests with a salary not greater than the pension. I therefore in fact served the public for nothing, as had I not held office I shd. have had the pension. It was at this time that Ld. Liverpool requested the King to grant to Mrs. Arbuthnot the pension that she has, & it was granted with many flattering & satisfactory observations from his Majesty. Here I ought to observe that when it was granted I was in very bad health. I had much injured my own private fortune in office. Had I then died, Mrs. Arbuthnot wd. have had nothing to maintain her but a sum for which I had insured my life; & my eldest son wd. not have had one single shilling but what he might have received from the bounty of his grandmother.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sir Alexander Grant.

<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Lisle

These are the circumstances under which the pension to Mrs. Arbuthnot was granted. It will not escape you that I might, if I had chosen, have received my own pension from 1807 to the present moment without the toil & turmoil of office ; & had this been my choice, I shd. now have had better nerves & better mental health, for no one but myself can tell what I underwent during the many years that I was at the Treasury. I ruined my health, & my fortune also from never being able to attend to my private affairs ; & having had all the patronage of the Govt pass thro' my hands during the whole time that Lord Liverpool was Prime Minister, I never had place or favour for myself or for anyone belonging to me : the reward I had was the pension to Mrs Arbuthnot, given at a time when my life was in a doubtful state—and I must leave it to the country to decide whether I had merited that reward or not.

It is not pleasant to talk about oneself. What I have said can be known to be true or not by many of my contemporaries. I have had nothing to conceal, & the same kindness which caused you to take the steps you did, will induce you to let what I have stated be known, in case the occasion shd. require it. . . .

#### 194. Sir Henry Hardinge to Charles Arbuthnot.

19 *February* [1834].—I write in a great hurry, but most anxiously, to say that in the debate last night, not a word was said which could make it desirable to get up & explain your case—and having been on the watch, you may rely on the accuracy of my report.<sup>1</sup>

The result howr. may be considered a fatal stab to the Monarchy—for exclusive of a majority of only 8, the amendt. was nearly as bad as Harvey's motion. I refer you to the Post for comments—we saved the Govt. by abt. 45 of our party voting with the Govt.

Baron Smith's case has so raised the indignation of many of our friends agt. the Ministry, that they wd. not go down.<sup>2</sup> The treachery is atrocious of making a conservative K. Speech to get rid of their own internal dissention, & then to take the first opportunity of truckling to O'C. in the basest manner. I scarcely think they will get thro' the session.

Knatchbull attacks them tomorrow on Baron Smith's case, & Chandos on Friday—but he will probably be advised to let the Estimates pass—and I shall for the same reason do nothing—the crisis is approaching. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Whittle Harvey moved for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the pension list. Mr. Ruthven was anxious to know what services Mrs. Arbuthnot had rendered the country to entitle her to the receipt of ' upwards of £9,365 of the public money '. The motion was defeated by 190 to 182.

<sup>2</sup> On the 13th O'Connell moved for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the conduct of Mr. Baron Smith, an Irish Judge. It was alleged that he often tried prisoners until midnight and delivered charges of a political character to grand juries. The motion was carried by 167 to 74, but on the 21st, on Knatchbull's motion, the vote was rescinded, by 161 to 155.

## 195. The Earl of Rosslyn to Mrs. Arbuthnot.

*No. 109 Jermyn Street, 19 February 1834.*—The division of last night affords the most melancholy proof of the little power that the Ministers have over their followers. In the miserable majority of 8 there were 45 of our friends. Three Lennoxes voted agt. the Government, & the course taken by Althorp was wretchedly shabby. I believe he would have done better had he stood firmly upon the principle & resisted the motion stoutly upon the true ground of breach of Parliamentary faith upon which it was partly argued.

This appears to me to be the most alarming event that we have seen, coupled with Althorp's excessive weakness and infirmity of purpose. It was with the utmost difficulty & much personal solicitation that many of our friends were retained to vote. . . . I think, however, if the question comes on again we shall do better, at least on our side.

## 196. John Charles Herries to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Albemarle Street, 22 February 1834.*— . . . Last night was full of good results. The Government cut a most wretched figure in the House & will be excessively damaged in the country. Peel was very great in both the debates <sup>1</sup> & has done himself great good with the *ultra-Tories*. Shaw was most admirable. His was a speech that would have been conspicuously good even in the best old times.<sup>2</sup> A few more nights such as this, & we should resume all our old habits & spirits in Parliament.

## 197. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Burghley House, 25 February 1834.*— . . . My visit [to London] gave me a conversation with the Duke about the pension. He aided me as to the statement to be sent to Ld. Althorp; & he (the Duke) now writes to me that my case is perfect, & that he shd. not care who saw the statement, or if it were fixed up at the Market Cross. It went yesterday to Ld. Althorp, & a copy of it to Hardinge for Peel to see. The Duke says that we *cannot* lose the pension, & that after all it cannot be taken away except by Act of Pt., which Act wd. have to pass thro' to the H. of Lords. . . .

## 198. Viscount Althorp to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Downing Street, 25 February 1834.*—I am very much obliged to you for the statement of your case. I need not tell you that I have frequently heard Mrs Arbuthnot's pension discussed by persons not as well inclined to you & her as I am, & I have always said from my knowledge of not only the work you have done but of the confidence always reposed in you by Lord Liverpool,

<sup>1</sup> On agricultural distress, and on the conduct of Baron Smith (*Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, xxi, 689, 740).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 711.

that I never have thought Mrs Arbuthnot's pension one of those to which any great objection could be made. You know the course I have taken upon this subject ; in 1831 I staked my office (between you & me no very great stake) upon the question. I referred back to this in the debate last Tuesday, & had intended to restate what I had said in words, but was told by those who know the feelings of the House well that my doing so might give offence & lose votes. When the division was over I told a man in the entire confidence of Hume & Co that had they carried the question I should have resigned the next day. Now this may seem to you an odd threat to use to the Opposition, but as I know that the Radical section of the Opposition are absurd enough to think that they may drive a part of the Administration out & keep me in, I was sure that letting this come to their knowledge would have a good effect, & it has, I believe ; for I hear they say that it will be unwise after so good a division to hazard another trial. I hope also that the supporters of the Government are aware also that I will not submit to be made the instrument of gross injustice, & that if they choose to inflict it they must find some other person to do the work. There are some dozen or so of these pensions which are very indefensible, viz, those where the receivers have become very rich & still keep pensions which it was very fit for them to have when they were poor. I do not believe it, but I hear that some of your political friends having discovered that if this question is carried they will get rid of me, are now saying, totidem verbis, that they think Mrs Arbuthnot's pension ought to be enquired into. If this is so I shall most certainly not pay very great respect to their characters. I do not believe it, but it is right you should know we have heard the report. It is also said that Mrs Arbuthnot's pension was granted at first on the understanding that it was not to be drawn during your life, & that in fact it was not so drawn till you were last in office. Let me know whether this is so ; I do not think it is. The objection, & the only one, to this pension is that it gives you two pensions, but still, as altogether you have not more than you might have had for the services you performed in England, exclusive of diplomacy, I do not think there is anything in it ; had it been reversionary, or if it was now made so, no human being could have a doubt of its propriety.

From the nature of this letter you will of course perceive that I mean it to be quite confidential. You hate my politics, you think I have ruined the country, but I believe you do not dislike me personally. I will not pretend however that I can act in this case upon the motives of private friendship ; fortunately, what I conceive to be my public duty in this case coincides with my feelings of private regard to you.

#### 199. Charles Arbuthnot to the Marquess of Tavistock.

*Woodford, 29 March 1834.*— . . . I think that much might be said upon the subject which was reasoned upon in your last letter. I should say from my own observation, & from what I generally heard, that in the general election in 1830 there was scarcely a voice uttered for reform, but that the

mania of the day was the slave question. As Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster I was invited to the opening of the railway at Liverpool in the September of that year; & Stanley, whom I saw there, could tell you that from hundreds of thousands there was an enthusiasm for the D. of Wellington such as I never witnessed before, & such as for no man shall I ever witness again. There was here & there a little tricolor flag, caused by the recent revolution at Paris, but the cheers for the Duke were deafening. Indeed, when we got to Manchester the constables were obliged to knock the people about to keep them from the Duke, every one wanting to shake his hand. This at that time did not look like want of reform; but I will give up the question, & will say with you that the people were dissatisfied & that a reform of Parlt. was absolutely necessary. May I not ask, however, whether such a reform as Lord Grey has given us was called for or was safe? Two Cabinet Ministers told me at a Drawing Room that the Reform Bill about to be introduced wd. give greater preponderance to property, & that they wd. not have agreed to any reform which was not to have that effect. I will not set about giving proofs that the Reform has had a direct contrary effect, because you must at once agree with me that the constituency, such as it now is, looks to Radicalism, & not to property; and sorry am I to add that even the present Ministers in making new appointments are obliged to consider, not whether the man is fit for the office, but whether the man to be appointed to the office can also be re-elected to a seat in Parliament. We saw how this was when the Govt. had to wait weeks & weeks before a seat cd. be vacated to name a successor to Hobhouse in Ireland,<sup>1</sup> & we have recently seen that we cannot have an Attorney General in the House.<sup>2</sup> Whether Whigs or Tories are to preside over the destinies of the country, we must, for safety sake, have a governing power somewhere; & with the preponderance given to the metropolis to the towns generally, & to the ten pound freeholders everywhere, it is clear to my mind, that without cause or necessity we have delivered ourselves up to the lowest part of our population. This surely was not requisite, & if we were to have reform, why had we not such a reform as your brother Lord John had in his former speeches said was the only safe reform, or such as Brougham himself had spoken for and contemplated? . . .

## 200. The Marquess of Tavistock to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Woburn Abbey, 1 April 1834.*—Altho' I may not very often agree with you, I like to hear your sentiments on public affairs. They are always given fairly & dispassionately, but you have mistaken me on one or two points. For instance, what I said about Althorp's *general* conduct you have applied to a particular period when the D. of Wellington was at the head of the Govt.

<sup>1</sup> John Cam Hobhouse was Irish secretary from March to April 1833; in May he was succeeded by E. J. Littleton.

<sup>2</sup> Sir John Campbell was appointed attorney-general in February 1834. He failed to secure re-election for Dudley, and was out of parliament for three months. He was returned for Edinburgh on 2 June.

whereas I meant my observation to extend over the votes he had given during the whole course of his opposition to Tory Governments, from the days of Percival to the Administration of Canning & the Duke—certainly not to the time you have fixed in your letter. I believe that he always wished & intended to keep out of office himself, & when he told you that you *wanted strengthening*, he felt well disposed to your Govt., and desired to see a junction between the Duke & Ld. Grey. After that, for a short time before your Administration was broken up, I admit that he appeared to fly back into opposition, & with this admission I hope I have explained my meaning sufficiently to make our opinions agree, so far as Althorp is concerned.

I believe the main cause of his going back into opposition is to be attributed to an impression that he & many of the party had received (perhaps unjustly) that the D. of W. was not acting fairly by Ld. Grey, & was not sincere in his professed desire to have his assistance in the Govt. Hence perhaps Ld. G.'s hostile speech,<sup>1</sup> of which you complain, and which closed the door upon all chance of a coalition. And to be sure, it did appear to those not behind the curtain, like Althorp, that the case was entirely in the Duke's hands, after the accession of the present King<sup>2</sup>; and that if no junction then took place, the fault was solely & exclusively the Duke's. The moment people got this into their heads, flying back into opposition was a very natural consequence.

Again, you are quite mistaken, I am sure, when you say that at the general election in 1830 there was scarcely a voice uttered for Reform. So strong indeed was the feeling in its favour at that time, & so much was it made a test of political principle at popular elections, that when Brougham gave notice of his motion on the subject, at the meeting of Parlt., & lists were made on both sides, it was calculated that the division would be very near, & (if I am not mistaken) *nine* was the largest majority given to either side. I mention this circumstance to prove to you the great strength the Reform Party had acquired in the new Parlt. What Brougham's plan was nobody knew, & I do not believe that it ever was put upon paper,<sup>3</sup> but it was understood that it wd. go *much* further than any of my brother's former motions, altho' probably not so far as the Bill that was afterwards brought in by the Govt.

Now with respect to the cordial reception which you tell me the D. of Wellington received in the manufacturing districts. You will recollect that at that time he had done nothing to forfeit the public confidence he had obtained. He had carried Cathc. emancipation—had assisted in carrying the repeal of the Test & Corporation Acts, and had established a great reputation as an economical Reformer. He had thus pleased the Dissenters—the friends of religious liberty—and the Reformers. He had commenced what *we* considered good government in this country. There was a strong belief everywhere that he would go on to the extent of putting the principle of *Parliamentary*

<sup>1</sup> 30 June 1830

<sup>2</sup> The royal veto on Grey's appointment to office disappeared when George IV died.

<sup>3</sup> It was outlined in his letter to Sir James Graham. (1 November 1830) Parker's *Graham*, i. 96.

Reform into action, and there was then every disposition among all parties, except the ultra-Tories, to give support to his Administration. Hence perhaps much of the applause he received on his tour. The opinions of Parlt.—the King's Speech—the Duke's declaration against Parly. Reform—the conduct of the Govt. towards Belgium &c. soon damped the hopes that had been raised. This reaction was strong—& those among the Whigs & Reformers who, up to this time, were most disposed to support Ministers, immediately *flew back* into decided opposition, & agreed to do their best to turn them out. What followed I will not now enter upon, except to assure you that you have been quite misinformed about my brother William's opinion. The extent of the Reform Bill might have astonished him, as it did many others, but so far from having thought that the Govt. had gone too far, he said that the measure required only shorter Parliaments to make it perfect. Of course it is to be presumed that the two Cabinet Ministers who spoke to you thought as Ld. Grey did, that the Bill wd. give greater preponderance to property. Whether they were right or wrong must be a matter of opinion, & left to 'experience & the evidence of facts'. I cannot think that the extent of the Reform Bill was framed (or agreed to by the Cabinet) with a view to 'render it impossible for the Tories ever again to govern the country, whatever might be the fate of the Whigs'. I cannot believe it possible that any public men, either Whigs or Tories, who have property to preserve, or characters to lose, cd. be influenced by motives so unworthy, & so unprincipled. What Ld. Grey thought & said on the subject, I do happen to know, & will tell you some day or other. It was far different indeed from the feeling which you tell me was attributed to him by his friends & supporters.

I believe I have now observed upon all those parts of your letter which appear to me to require an answer. What you say about the spirit at our Universities & public schools is very true, & may tend, I hope, to prevent the prevailing desire for change from running wild. My father, to whom I mentioned what you said in your former letter about the Whigs being dissatisfied with Reform, protests against being included in the number, with the exception of that part of it which relates to official seats, & which was always foreseen & he hopes may be remedied with one or two other minor matters. . . .

My father always regretted Ld. Grey's declaration of hostility against the D. of W.'s Govt., but he thinks he had not the least idea at that time of upsetting his Administration. However, it was sufficient to produce a breach.

*Ibid.*, *W[oburn] Abbey*, 5 April [1834].—Only one word more—I did not mean to include *Lady* William, when I denied on the part of my brother, what you heard of his opinion on the Reform Bill. I believe *she* thought it much too sweeping, & probably said so to her Tory friends. . . .

It is singular that just after I had written to you the other day Ld. Grey came here, and in the course of a conversation I happened to have with him, in which he spoke of the latter part of the D. of W.'s Administration, he told me that he never felt any hostility to his Govt. or contemplated any systematic opposition to him. I then instanced the speech he made when he came to

town, but he declared that, even then, he intended nothing more than to speak his sentiments on public affairs, without wishing to overturn the Govt., & without being influenced by any feeling that he was not fairly treated by the Duke. I attributed that feeling to many of his *friends*, & I still think that it was one of the main causes of their flying back into opposition.

I did not mean to enter into the question of foreign policy with you—still less to condemn the D. of W. on that subject, or to defend everything that the present Ministers have done. I merely mentioned Belgium, on which Hobhouse had given notice of a motion,<sup>1</sup> and no one felt better disposed to support the Govt. than he did, till the meeting of Parl. . . .

You are quite right in what you say about the ultra-Tories, I mean with regard to their intention to vote with us on Reform. I had not considered that sufficiently, but still there can be no doubt of the desire for Reform having spread very much in 1830. Sr. J. Byng, who commanded the northern district, cd. give you some striking proof of it.

#### 201. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Carlton Gardens, 26 April 1834.*— . . . The papers will have told you the result of the Trades Union meeting.<sup>2</sup> The numbers that marched were between 26, & 27,000 men. They were counted by many military men. They were completely organised, & very quiet in their behaviour. The Government had been greatly alarmed, & now they affect to ridicule such meetings. On this you may rely, for I have the 2 facts of their previous alarm, & of their present indifference from the best sources. We had, I understand, between 3 & 4000 troops, horse & foot, & a good deal of artillery. We had also a very strong force of police. We therefore shd. have soon put the procession to the rout; but if these meetings are continued the evil-minded will gain confidence, & the difficulty may become terrible. Nothing could equal the anxiety of the soldiers to have a blow at them; & this was witnessed by Wm. de Roos who was present when the Horse Guards were ordered to mount & march, & who also saw Dr. Wade, the Radical clergyman leader, get into a hackney coach to drive away the moment he found that troops were in sight. But we must bear in mind that the present Ministers do all they can to disgust the army, & to destroy discipline; & if once the soldiers mutinied, a revolution could not be avoided. As yet we know that the soldiers will do their duty, & that the police also is dreaded by the populace. Our case is fortunately very different from that of France. In France the effect of the conscription is to throw every three years 60,000 soldiers into the mass of the population, & the effect of this is to make the mobs consist of disbanded military men. Our mobs are otherwise constituted, & they fly like sheep whenever attacked. I heard of a man in the streets asking an artilleryman how many would be hurt by the discharge of one gun. The artilleryman

<sup>1</sup> See *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, i 297 (8 November 1830).

<sup>2</sup> The monster demonstration in London on the 21st on behalf of the six Dorchester labourers, who were sentenced to seven years' transportation, nominally for administering illegal oaths, really for forming an agricultural union.



gravely replied that he could not be sure of killing more than 70 at a time ; & this seemed to horrify the man of the people. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, 7 May 1834.— . . . You will have seen that the majority was immense.<sup>1</sup> Above 100 Tories voted with the Govt., so that upon the 2nd division the Tories caused the majority. It was with great difficulty some of the Tories were induced to vote, so great is their abhorrence of the Whigs ; but it was felt to be a question of the Monarchy, for had that blackguard scoundrel carried his motion, the compact made with the King wd. have been broken, & I don't see who could have undertaken to be his Ministers but the Radicals.

It is a great satisfaction to me that it is over. I never feared to lose by the result, but it certainly has been misery to me to be blackguarded, & by such miscreants against whom I could do nothing. I feel that I have passed a long public life without grasping for my own interest ; & I never could have supposed that I was to be abused & vilified for the only reward I ever received.

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, Monday, 2 June 1834.— . . . You know that Stanley &c. are gone out. It is now 4 o'clock, & I don't believe the Govt. is reconstructed. At 2 o'clock today Ld. Althorp had a meeting of 200, they say, & he announced to them (as we hear) that he shd. inform the House tonight that it was the intention of the Govt. to issue a commission to enquire into the extent [of] the revenues of the Irish Church ; & that if this information did not stop Mr. Ward's resolutions he shd. move the previous question against them.<sup>2</sup>

The Commission could be for nothing but the future spoliation of the Church.

Stanley & Graham have pasted up their names in the bench below the Treasury Bench, & mean, I hear, to abuse the Govt. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, Saturday, 12 July 1834 — . . . It seems that the Whig Government is at an end. What will happen Heaven knows, I don't ; but I *think* you will see a Govt. formed by the Duke & Peel. *Pray don't say* to any human being—but as I have no secrets to you I will tell you that *they* (those two) are in communication with the King. You will ruin me if you let this transpire. . . .<sup>3</sup>

*Ibid.*, *Carlton Gardens*, 15 July 1834.— . . . I have had the influenza, &

<sup>1</sup> Daniel Whittle Harvey's motion for an Address to the Crown praying for an inquiry into the pension list was negatived by 390 to 148 ; Strutt's amendment for the appointment of a select committee to ascertain the nature of any abuses which might have occurred in the granting of pensions, was defeated by 311 to 230 (5 May) Mrs. Arbuthnot's pension was not referred to in the debate.

<sup>2</sup> On 27 May H. G. Ward moved a resolution declaratory of the justice and necessity of immediately depriving the Church of Ireland of part of its temporalities. Stanley, Graham, Richmond and Goderich, refusing to countenance the principle of lay appropriation, resigned.

<sup>3</sup> Littleton, the Irish secretary, had privately informed O'Connell that the most stringent clauses of the Irish Coercion Bill would be left out of the new bill, but Grey, ignorant of these secret negotiations and of the fact that they were countenanced by Althorp and Wellesley, the lord-lieutenant, forced the cabinet to accept the clauses. O'Connell betrayed Littleton's confidences, and Althorp resigned, his resignation occasioning that of Grey. William IV tried unsuccessfully to form a coalition of whigs and conservatives.

I think it has affected my spirits, which may cause me to look more gloomily on our public affairs than I otherwise should. But whether I am too gloomy or not, I fear that the country is now in a more hopeless state than ever. The King has treated us most infamously. He made a sort of invitation to our Party to join the remnant of Ld. Grey's Government, well knowing that we could not in honour or principle, & then he gave Ld. Melbourne full power to reconstruct his Radical Government. A baser trick was never practised. It will enable the Whigs to get thro' the session; & it proves to the whole world that the King is resolved to run his course of destruction. He has at last given positive proof of his hatred of our party. The country suffers by it, but the first victim will be the King himself. You will have seen in the papers that Ld. Althorp resumes office. He resigned, & thereby caused his friend Lord Grey to resign. He now comes back to office!!! His conduct is called base, dishonest, treacherous in the extreme. This is the language of Lord Grey's relations & connections; & during the whole course of my long life I never knew any act so execrated as the base trickery of Lord Althorp. Unless here on the spot you could not figure to yourself anything equal to the abuse heaped upon him by friends as well as foes. . . .<sup>1</sup>

*Ibid.*, Carlton Gardens, 18 July 1834.— . . . Lord Althorp is felt to have disgraced himself irretrievably. His conduct to Lord Grey is thought most base & treacherous. I don't believe that our Party wd. ever notice me if now, after what has happened, I was to pay him a visit. His allowing Littleton to bear the whole blame without rising to declare that he had sanctioned his talking with O'Connell—his afterwards confessing that he had concerted it with Littleton, & that it had been concealed from Lord Grey—his resignation, *thereby* causing Lord Grey to resign—his return to office after sacrificing Lord Grey—all these circumstances, besides many others, have totally & for ever destroyed his character. I never heard any one so abused; & even Ld. Rosslyn, quiet as he is, cannot contain himself, but is quite vociferous in his abuse of the treachery to Lord Grey.

It is very difficult to learn what Ld. Grey thinks of it, but he is said to be hurt beyond description, & that he is more depressed in spirits than he ever was is a fact. Lord Howick has resigned<sup>2</sup>; & C. Wood, Lord Grey's son-in-law, will resign also, as I am told.<sup>3</sup> Our friends say that Ministers will get thro' the session. I suppose they will. They have conciliated O'Connell by that basest of all appointments—Lord Duncannon!!!<sup>4</sup> At the same time I must tell you that the Govt. is despised & ridiculed. But of what good is this, having a King ready to destroy himself & his Monarchy? Poor wretched fool, he is the object of general contempt. We must not deceive ourselves. He is bent not to have the Conservatives, & it wd. not surprise if the next change brought in Hume & all the gang. . . .

<sup>1</sup> There was, of course, no justification for these strictures on the conduct of either the king or of Althorp.

<sup>2</sup> His office of under-secretary for home affairs.

<sup>3</sup> He did not resign the office of joint secretary of the treasury.

<sup>4</sup> Appointed home secretary.

## 202. Memorandum by Sir Herbert Taylor.

14 November 1834. *Private. Copy.*—The contingencies of which the King expressed his apprehension *verbally* to Lord Melbourne were

The further encroachments upon the establishment of the Protestant Church which from the communication which Lord Duncannon had made to his Majesty, and the language held by others of Lord Melbourne's colleagues, appeared to be meditated by them.

The use which some of them seemed to be disposed to make, by anticipation of the results of the Commission of Enquiry into the state of the Irish Church, which his Majesty had sanctioned as a measure of simple enquiry, and which he had invariably declared to be so considered by himself, but which some of the members of the Government, & more particularly Lord John Russell, had declared to be the preliminary to extensive reforms, such as his Majesty did not contemplate, and was determined to resist.

He could not look with confidence or security to the services of a Leader of the House of Commons on the Government side who was so pledged, and he could not help considering Lord John Russell to be otherwise unequal to the task.

N.B. His Majesty was aware also from what Lord Melbourne had stated to him, that both Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Spring Rice had signified their intention of retiring if the measures contemplated by some of their colleagues should be pressed, hence a schism in the Cabinet was threatened upon a leading question, & one upon which his Majesty was in feeling and principle opposed to the advocates of encroachment.

The alternative which now presented itself could not be long deferred, and his Majesty might find himself called upon to make the decision at a period and under circumstances which might be productive of much greater embarrassment and difficulty than any which could possibly, in his opinion, result from a change of Government at present.

Lord Melbourne had fairly admitted that he could not hope for success from any attempt at coalition at present, any more than he did when he accepted his present office, and his Majesty had reason therefore to apprehend that accession of strength and official aid must be sought in the ranks of those whom his Majesty could not look upon as being influenced by those *Conservative* principles for which he gave credit to his Lordship and to some of his colleagues, to whom he looked for a correspondence of feeling with a confidence which the introduction of others, less willing to support the established institutions of the country, could not fail to diminish. Hence both his Majesty and his principal Ministers would be placed in a false position.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the dismissal of the Melbourne ministry on the 14th, see *Melbourne papers*, p. 219 sqq., and Stockmar's *Memoirs*, i. 307 sqq. Peel's ministry lasted only until the following April.

## 203. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Apsley House, 20 February 1835.*—In less than an hour after I sent off my letter to you yesterday, the account was brought of our defeat in the H. of Commons.<sup>1</sup>

It would be absurd to attempt to disguise that this defeat may be fatal. I had always thought that our opponents gave us the fairest chance by selecting a subject of attack on which we were likely to have supporters, who might never give us a vote afterwards: and now that on such a subject we have been beaten, it is a proof, I think, that they can always beat us whenever Whigs & Radicals will put aside their differences for the purpose of combining against us. I see very few persons, & therefore I am not good authority with respect to the general opinion of our Party. The Duke thinks it as bad as I do. Lord Rosslyn does not take a better view of it. These are the only two I have seen, & most probably I shall see no one else today.

It is not known, at least I don't know, whether they will oppose the Address. If they do, we shall be beaten again I take for granted.<sup>2</sup> But the worst is, at least the worst in my mind, there is an intention to make a motion against the D. of Welln. for what they call his dictatorship in taking upon himself the whole Govt. when waiting for Peel's arrival.<sup>3</sup> With the united strength of Whigs & Radicals they can carry any motion, even if it be an Address to the King to remove the Duke from his My.'s presence & councils. All this quite between ourselves. It agitates one very much to think it possible that the man who saved the Empire shd. be exposed to such black ingratitude; but so this world is, & tho' we must all remain in it, & strive to do our duty in it, as long as it may please God to keep us here, yet everything that passes serves to wean me more & more from it.

When I had written thus far I was interrupted by Lord Cowley, & then Lady Burghersh came.

The conversation with each turned as you may imagine upon the disaster of yesterday on the vote for the Speaker's Chair. It has made the deepest impression on everybody; an impression partaking of despair & of indignation. Some seem to hope that a sense of shame will check the best of the Whigs, & that they will not consent to a junction with the Radicals; but I am to learn who the best of the Whigs are. . . .

*Ibid., Apsley House, 24 February 1835.*— . . . We don't know what will happen this night in the H. of Commons. If our opponents all keep together we must be defeated, for we can add little or nothing to the numbers on the former division. The only good symptom I have heard is that Spring Rice has declared in a letter that he will not be a party to the factious destruction of the present Govt. He certainly has thus written, & the letter is known

<sup>1</sup> The whigs successfully attacked the government by opposing Mannors-Sutton's re-election as speaker, Abercromby being elected by 316 to 306.

<sup>2</sup> The government was defeated on the Address by 309 to 302 on the 26th.

<sup>3</sup> In November 1834, when the King dismissed Melbourne, Wellington took the seals of the three secretariats of state until Peel returned from Italy to form a government.

to one of our Ministers. I hardly think that he wd. have thus declared himself if he was not fully aware that others had the same determination as himself. If our opponents should not stick close together we may be saved, but not otherwise. I shall not be able to tell you anything by today's post, but I will keep my letter open as long as I can, & I will write constantly. I believe what you say of my turn of mind has some truth in it. I am by nature dreadfully nervous, even to the great injury of my health; but when serious concerns press upon me I am able to reflect, & to know that there is more danger in giving way than in acting with firmness . . .

The Whig-Radicals are intending to move a vote of censure on the Duke for what they call his Dictatorship.<sup>1</sup> This annoys me, & makes me indignant—with such a H. of Cs. as the Reform Bill has given the country, this or any other vote can be carried. . . .

*Ibid.*, Woodford, 4 March 1835.— . . . I have this morning a letter from the D. of Welln., & one from Lord Cowley. They both of them tell me that our friends are in high spirits, & that the general belief is that the Govt. will stand. It is clear that the Opposition are already crumbling to pieces. Mr Hume takes one line. Major Beauclerk another. And Ld. John Russell a line different from them both. Lord John put, as you will have seen, some silly questions to Sir Rt. Peel; & this enabled him to give most triumphant answers & explanations. The effect in London has been great, I understand. We shall have many *ups* and *downs*; & if the Govt. shd. last, as I verily believe it will, it will have to wade thro' many months of great toil & trouble. You will see us defeated very often; but nothing short of stopping the supplies, & the preventing our passing the Mutiny Bill, would have any fatal effect. Already some of the Opposition declare that they will not stop the supplies, & will not give votes to destroy the present Government. All this will create great irritation among themselves, by which we could not fail to profit. . . .

*Ibid.*, Woodford, 12 March 1835.— . . . You will have seen that on the malt tax we had a very large majority.<sup>2</sup> The Whigs voted with us, & thus gave us such a majority. But we are not to thank them for it, for I had already heard that they boasted of having a majority of 90 in the H. of Coms. and that they felt sure of getting the Government into their hands. This I know is their language, & they could not but feel that if they were in office they must keep the malt tax, & for this reason & for it alone they voted now to keep it.

Lord Grey has come to London & is very violent, particularly against the Duke of Wellington. Indeed I understand that he has declared his willingness to take the Foreign Office, either under Peel or Stanley.

There has recently been a meeting at Woburn at which Lord Grey was. The Duke of Bedford after the meeting wrote 'that even anarchy was better than despotism, & that at all risks & hazards the present Government must be driven out'. Their project to get rid of Ld. Lyndhurst, the D. of Wn., Goulburn & Herries; & then to join Peel, whom they think they can manage.

<sup>1</sup> They did not do so.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Chandos' motion for the repeal of the malt tax was rejected by 350 to 192.

I have all this from the best authority, but pray do not mention it. It is said that they intend to divide with Hume tomorrow night (Friday) for limiting the supplies to three months; & I fear that they will have a considerable majority against us, for the Stanley party will vote against us, I expect. I think so because Ld. Stanley & Sir Js. Graham have both declared on the hustings & elsewhere, that they have no confidence in the present Ministers. . . .

*Ibid.*, Woodford, 17 March 1835.—I have not written for some days, because I was in hopes, or rather had the wish, that I might be able to tell you the Government was prospering. I fear that there is very little chance of its standing, but I intreat you to be silent about this. It would ensure defeat were it to get wind that we expected it, but I write it to you because I write to you all things.

The system is to attack the Duke of Wn. in every possible way, directly & indirectly. The Radicals feel that he is the stumbling block in their way, & could they get rid of him they wd. easily destroy the Government.

It was on this account that they attacked Ld. Londonderry,<sup>1</sup> because it was the Duke's appointment. It is for this reason also that they attack the Cinque Ports, & everything with which he is connected.

It will be also with this view that they will, I doubt not, move a censure on him for filling more offices than one. In short they will leave no stone unturned to effect their object of injuring the Duke; & as you will have seen, this is the game played also by Lord Stanley. In short we are in a perilous state, but pray breathe not this to anyone.

Lord Londonderry has resigned, & it was the only thing to be done, but it is a sad business, & a cruel triumph for the Whig-Radicals. . . . Peel would gladly resign. I dread his doing so. . . .

#### 204. The Earl of Rosslyn to the Duke of Wellington.

*Grosvenor Place, 27 April 1835.*—Villiers has returned to town having upon an examination of the canvass found that there was no hope of coming within 40. The Deal *pilots* with the exception of one all voted for him, & the Walmer people were with him. He saw the Bishop of Oxford as he passed thro' Canterbury, who told him it would be a close struggle there, & would cost from £1500 to £2000. He consequently will not touch it.

Lord Gran. Somerset has seen a deputation from Canterbury, who give a very plausible statement of the numbers, which seems more favourable. I have communicated to him & Ross Wetherall's answer; & we have agreed to send Dr. Spry, and the deputation of tradesmen to Serjt. Spankie, & Lord Granville has written to him.

It seems, from the account I collected, that if a *good candidate* went down, & risked from £100 to £150 now, it would probably prevent the acceptance of office, & the opening of the seat, but would ensure a return the next

<sup>1</sup> On the 13th Sheil's motion condemning the appointment of Lord Londonderry as ambassador to Russia caused him to withdraw

time. This, however, is not a very enticing speculation, even if it were well founded.<sup>1</sup>

I hear that Brougham says that it cannot go on as the Government stands ; & there seems to be great reason to believe that Howick will not stand any closer union with the Radicals. This is certainly in the spirit of Grey's conversation. . . .

### 205. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Woodford, 6 May 1835.*— . . . If we beat Ld J. Russell it will be a great gain upon which I had not ventured to calculate. I think that we do not manage elections well. I do, however, now hope with confidence that we shall keep him out of Pt., or at least out of Devonshire, & it will be a terrible blow to the Radical Administration. I had been given to understand that our success in Yorkshire wd. mainly depend upon the result of the Devonshire election. . . .<sup>2</sup>

*Ibid., Woodford, Thursday, 3 December 1835.*— . . . When I was at the Treasury I had quite agreed to go to Bombay if there had been at the time an opening for me, & in this I had been encouraged by one whose judgement never erred. It was thought at the time that it wd. be useful to me in my career. . . .

*Ibid., [20 June 1836].*— . . . I think that *England* is becoming more & more Conservative—*Scotland* and *Ireland* more & more Radical. Our strength in the H. of Cs. don't show to advantage, for many who are well disposed to us dread a dissolution, & keep away when they ought to be present. But on the Irish Church question we are strong, & shall remain so I think. The H. of Lords has shown itself as firm as a rock, & firm I have no doubt it will continue to be. The King is, I have reason to believe, very uneasy, & wd. gladly get rid of his Ministers if he knew how. The Ministers are now quite amalgamated with O'Connell & the Radicals, but fortunately our vast majority in the Lords keeps them in check. The approaching trial of Ld. Melbourne for crim. con., as you will see in the papers, is a severe blow on the Government.<sup>3</sup> It has been thought that he wd. resign. I am assured that he meant to resign, but that he yielded to the intreaties of his colleagues to stay with him. How it will be if he shd. be cast I cannot tell. Much will depend upon the nature of the evidence, & upon the letters to be produced. It was positively said in London that in one of his letters to Mrs Norton he excused himself

<sup>1</sup> Lord Albert Denison Conyngham and Frederick Villiers were elected for Canterbury at the general election in January 1835, but in March the house of commons amended the return by substituting S. R. Lushington for Villiers. There was no subsequent by-election.

<sup>2</sup> Russell, now home secretary, was defeated by the conservative candidate Montagu Parker, the numbers being 3,755 and 3,128 (Walpole's *Russell*, i. 234). He was soon brought in for Stroud. Lord Morpeth, now Irish secretary, was re-elected for Yorkshire (W.R.).

<sup>3</sup> On the 22nd Melbourne appeared in the court of common pleas as co-respondent in the case Norton v. Lord Melbourne. The verdict was for the defendant.

for not going to her because the d——d old fool at Windsor had sent for him. He is also said to have fallen very foul of his colleagues in his letters. It will soon be seen what letters are producible, for the trial is fixed for Wednesday next—that is, the day after tomorrow.

The Govt. has had another awkward circumstance. You will see in the papers that there is a subscription for O'Connell, & that the D. of Bedford has subscribed £100.<sup>1</sup> This has annoyed all the Ministers, & particularly Ld. Tavistock & Ld. J. Russell. The latter said (I know) that it was the worst blow they had had—worse, he said, than Ld. Melbourne's affair. The foolish Duke subscribed without saying a word to any one, & it has clenched the connection with O'Connell.

The connection for us with Ld. Stanley & Sir Js. Graham is complete.<sup>2</sup> Peel is to dine at Lord Stanley's on the 23rd inst, & the Duke of Wn. is to meet him (by arrangement) on the 2nd of next month. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Apsley House*, 21 July 1836 — . . . I think it is quite evident that the Tories are progressively gaining ground. I know that this is felt by the Ministers. They *cannot* go the length required of them by the Radicals, & the result is that between them there is no cordial union.

The Radicals will vote for them to keep us out, because they know that with them they can better undermine & overthrow the institutions of the country; but they hate each other cordially, & thus you will collect from the debates. In the country, & out of the House, we are gaining strength daily, & this is shown upon almost every vacancy when there is a new election.

It is however very uphill work. The ten pounders; the Metropolitan boroughs, the Radical boroughs in Scotland; & O'Connell's tail in Ireland, form a force which it is very difficult to overcome. I should fear that if Parliament were to be dissolved by the present Ministers, we could not add to our numbers, as there are always a good many places which are under Government influence; but had we the dissolution in our own hands, my belief is that we shd. be gainers & sufficiently to have a majority in a new Parliament.—I cannot think that the Ministers now in office wd. attempt a dissolution. It has been much talked of, but I fancy without foundation.

In the meanwhile we have the House of Lords to throw out or alter all destructive measures, & we have the satisfaction of seeing that that branch of the Legislature stands higher & higher in public estimation.—The Irish Church Bill has been again sent up to the Lords with the same Appropriation Clause as of last year.—On Monday or Tuesday next it will be altered by them; & I take for granted that upon being returned to the Commons without the Clause, the Bill will be rejected as was done before. So you see that the Tithe question remains unsettled. I have reason to believe that the Ministers wd. give much to get rid of the question. They know that it is an unpopular one for them in England, & their last division annoyed them greatly. There

<sup>1</sup> Elected for Dublin in 1835, O'Connell was unseated on petition, and the defence of his seat is said to have cost at least £8,000.

<sup>2</sup> At this time Graham crossed the floor of the house, taking his seat on the opposition benches (*Parker's Graham*, i 242).



will be one more division in the H. of C. upon it, when the Bill goes back without the Clause, & we hope that our numbers will be as good if not better than on the last occasion.—I don't think that I have anything more to tell you on politics. Trade flourishes. Agriculture has improved. The cry for reform has died away, & this country wd. be quite tranquil & most happy if the Radicals were not striving to do all the mischiefs in their power. I say nothing to you of O'Connell. You will see in the papers what he is about. You will also see that the D. of Bedford & some others have subscribed to him. The result for the D. of Bedford has been that the King ordered his bust to be removed from his gallery.

I heard of Sir A. Paget's having boasted (in presence of a friend of mine) that he had walked arm in arm with O'Connell up & down St. James's St.—I am very glad you have not his son in yr. regiment.

The way to make a Radical is for any one so to have conducted himself as to throw him into the background, & then from sourness & disappointment he wd. destroy everything & everybody. Sir Arthur by his marriage damaged all his prospects in life (for he cd. not go with Lady Augusta to any foreign Court)<sup>1</sup>; & now out of spite & anger, having no one to be angry with but himself, he wd. gladly overthrow all the institutions of the country.—Bitterness of spirit is the way to make a patriot! . . .

You will have seen in the papers Ld. Melbourne's trial. It is a positive fact that the box containing all Mrs Norton's letters were stolen by a friend of her's out of Mr. Norton's house after she had left him. This may account for the acquittal. Ld. Melbourne has had an escape, but the trial has greatly damaged him, & must I think have destroyed the lady. It was said that the Whigs meant to support her. I can't imagine that they could do her much good. At least it is not likely that any ladies of respectability wd. consent to associate with her.—But I know very little of what passes in the world, as I never go into it, & all I learn is by hearsay.

*Ibid.*, Hatfield, 1 November 1836.— . . . Those who had desponded the most after the passing of the Reform Bill now own that our improvement has been far greater than could have been expected, & I do not believe that there are many who fear for the ultimate safety of the country. In spite of the ten pounders, & of the Metropolitan boroughs, which are the worst of all, we, the Conservatives, have now the majority of *English* votes in the H. of Commons. We are improving much, I am assured, in Scotland, but truth obliges me to own that our prospects in Ireland go as yet from bad to worse. Many thought that the dismissal of Ld. Melbourne &c in 1834 was premature. I believe it was; & certainly the dissolution left us still in the minority. But in the preceding Parlt. we had not above 130 at most to be relied upon; & now we are a minority of 300. I have seen the Govt. list, & they give us 297. This large minority includes Ld. Stanley & Sir Js. Graham, but they are now heart & soul united to us. This very powerful minority, rendered still more

<sup>1</sup> He married Lady Augusta Fane, daughter of the tenth earl of Westmorland, on 16 February 1809, immediately after her first husband, Lord Borlghdon, afterwards first earl of Morley, had divorced her.

powerful by our vast superiority in debate, gives confidence to the House of Peers, & enables the Lords to amend & throw out measures wch. wd. be injurious to our institutions. It is always thought that the session wch. approaches will be a critical [one]. This is thought now more than ever. One cannot pretend to prophecy, but one has reason to hope that our affairs will get better instead of worse. In the meanwhile thank God the Duke looks younger & healthier than I have seen him for a long time; & it wd. delight you to see how universally he is now admired & looked up to by all ranks & I might say by all parties.

Poor Lord Westmorland is in a sad state. He had been at Brighton, & came to London some weeks ago to be couched. He was so alarmed & agitated (tho' it is next to no pain) that he insisted upon being tied down, & he was held by four men. He put himself into such a phrenzy that after the operation was over he vomited violently, broke a blood vessel in the eye that had been couched; & I fear it is too certain that he will not recover his sight. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Apsley House*, 29 April 1837.— . . . No one can guess whether the Ministers will resign or not. They had at one time resolved to do it. They then changed their mind, & how it will be now I believe that not even they themselves can tell. It will I dare say depend on circumstances. They meant to resign when the H. of Lds. should throw out their Irish Municipal Bill. That Bill is now with the Lords. It will be in Committee there next week, & it certainly will be thrown out, for it is the very Bill of last year. But the Conservative Party will consent to establish Corporations in Ireland under such provisions as will make them safe for the Protestants. This will not suit the Radicals. What will be the result no one can guess. Our Party is well united. It is in the H. of C. the most powerful Opposition that was ever known, & in the H. of Lords it has an immense majority. Lord Stanley & Sir J. Graham are heart & soul with us. The D. of Wellington has met them both on business, & is greatly pleased with them. So far all is well, but still we have no right to feel sure that even a dissolution by us wd. give us a majority in the Commons, & without it the country cannot be governed. The D. of Wn. made last week a speech on our foreign policy & on Spanish affairs wch. has produced the most extraordinary effect.<sup>1</sup> Brougham says it was the most clear & conclusive speech he ever heard in Pt. It is corrected for the Mirror,<sup>2</sup> & when printed it shall be sent to you. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Woodford*, 28 June 1837.—I must begin by telling you that we have lost our King. He died on the 20th of this month. Much evil came upon the country from his reign, but far more from his death. He meant well; but it is a great calamity to have so very young a Sovereign who can have no opinions of her own, & the influence of her mother has not been good. The Queen has kept her present Ministers, & indeed I don't think that she could have done otherwise, supported by a majority in the H. of Commons, tho' that majority is to be sure but a small one.

But the worst is that the Parliament will be dissolved by the men now in power, & this is an advantage to them of between 20 & 30 votes. Still

<sup>1</sup> *Parl. Deb*, 3rd series, xxxviii 137.

<sup>2</sup> *The Mirror of parliament*.

it is said by those who calculate for us that altho' we shall lose considerably in Ireland, we shall be gainers upon the whole by some votes. I was in London when the King died. All who attended the Privy Council were in unbounded admiration of the young Queen's demeanour, her self possession, her calmness & her dignity. The Duke of Wellington told me that he could not have been less alarmed & nervous than she was, & he said that he would not but have been present for the whole world. It is such early days that I cannot say more. Her behaviour was excellent—I pray to God that her conduct may be likewise.

Since I wrote last I have recd. yr. two letters nos. 16 & 17. I am in despair at learning from you that you receive none of mine. With the exception of the last month I have written every month; & since you told me to write overland I have done so constantly. Mr. Melvill told me that you wd. be sure to receive the overland letters in two months, as they get to Bombay in a shorter time. I did not write last month for I had come for a short time from London, & I desired Caroline<sup>1</sup> to write instead of me. I cannot tell you how anxious I am for yr. return to England. When I wrote last I told you that Lord Fitzroy had written you a letter upon showing which to the General commanding in Ceylon you wd. be sure to get leave of absence. We all imagine that you have made an exchange with the officer who has succeeded to the 78th, as we have received various intimations that you had arranged it with him in the event of Col. Lindsay selling in his regt.; but you have never mentioned it. I hope and trust you have, for it would be approved of at the Horse Guards, & it would give you the command of a regt. in England. I might then hope that during the remainder of my life you would not have to go on foreign service, which would be the greatest comfort to me. I am now in my 71st year, & I cannot expect to remain on earth many more years. . . . In about 3 weeks the dissolution will take place, & a most important crisis will it be. If we do as well as we expect we shall be able to save the country. Should our opponents be triumphant the worst may happen. As all *their* majorities have been very small in the H. of Commons, the Lords have been able to throw out all mischievous measures; but should they ever have a *large* majority in the Commons, the Lords wd. not be able to resist & the Monarchy would be in the greatest peril. Added to this we may expect that at the commencement of the new reign there would be many Peers made, & this would render our overwhelming majority much nearer on a par than it has been hitherto—and also we are to bear in mind that with the late King on the throne we knew very well that we had his wishes, & our only fear was that he would show them too soon, & before the country was ripe for a change. Now on the contrary we know that all the influence of the mother<sup>2</sup> is against us, & for some time to come we may expect that her influence will have weighed with her daughter. In every respect, therefore, our present prospects are gloomy. . . .

*Ibid.*, Woodford, 13 February 1838.— . . . I wish I could tell you anything satisfactory on politics. You will have known that we gained at the general

<sup>1</sup> Arbuthnot's elder daughter.

<sup>2</sup> The duchess of Kent.

election, & that we almost equal our opponents in numbers, & beat them out & out in talent. But yet I am sorry to say we are apparently farther than ever from turning them out. They have the Queen with them, heart & soul as it wd. appear. Whenever the Radicals propose revolutionary measures we are obliged to support them, & when we press them hard they are sure to be supported by the Radicals. I can't guess, therefore, how it will be possible to move them. You will see in the papers that Ld. Melbourne dines with the Queen every day, & that all the other Ministers do occasionally. King William did all the mischief possible while he lived, but he did more mischief by dying. We hear nothing of the Queen, but we see her acts. She & the Dss. of Kent are on worse terms than ever. This Canada rebellion is a most serious affair. We crushed it in Lower Canada through the vigour & judgment of Sir J. Colborne; but we seem to be in a scrape now in Upper Canada. Sir F. Head chose to think that he could do without any troops, & he sent them all to Sir J. Colborne in Lower Canada. A rebellion immediately broke out in Upper Canada, & tho' he dispersed the rebels, they got into an island on the St. Lawrence & have there fortified themselves. The worst of it is that they are aided by men, & stores & provisions from the United States; & we shall be in luck if added to our rebellion we have not a war with America. This is all as yet known. You will see the debates in the 2 Houses; and you will see that Lord Durham is going to be sent out as what may be called *Dictator*. In the meanwhile our Party are in a phrenzy to try to turn out the Government. I believe the Duke & Peel doubt our being able to hold the Government if we had it, & we should consider that if we fail it will be fatal. It will be our last struggle to all human appearance. What will be attempted I cannot tell. It wd. be impossible for words to describe the contempt in wch. the Ministers are universally held. They are execrated throughout the country, & by none more than by the Radicals. But still Parties are so circumstanced that they are likely to stay in. It is a most grievous state of things. If the late King had [? lived]<sup>1</sup> we might have turned them out; but with the young foolish Queen against us we can have but little hope. She seems to be full of power for evil—and to be full of weakness for good. I have told you all that I know, & you will think it little enough. . . .

*Ibid.*, Woodford, 1 August 1838.— . . . A more perfect angel<sup>2</sup> in form & mind was never seen on earth. She was in all respects everything that was most lovely; and had it pleased God for her to remain on earth, what joy would she have had in possessing children such as mine are. Your success in yr. profession would have gladdened her heart; but still more would she have loved you for the goodness of yr. heart. How I ever recovered from the loss of her has often amazed me. I hope I need not tell you that I was devoted to her; but I was comparatively young at the time, & I was forced to occupy myself with public business. She never has been out of my thoughts, & it has invariably been my hope & trust that we were to meet again.

With such thoughts as these in my mind it may seem strange to you that I ever formed another connection. That connection, however, it has been

<sup>1</sup> MS. torn.

<sup>2</sup> His first wife.

the will of the Almighty to break also asunder. Of her who is more recently gone I need say the less as you knew her well. I should not be just to her, or do justice to my own feelings, if I were not to say that I have been blessed with two whose conduct to me has been angelic. When I formed my last connection I was considerably advanced in years; & had it not been for her strong mind, & for her never failing anxiety to save me from every discomfort, I verily believe that in my last years of official life I should have broken down. How I have suffered from each of my dreadful losses can be known only to myself; but this last blow came upon me when I had no longer strength of mind or of body to bear up against it, & the effect has been to throw me for the remainder of my life very much into retirement. . . .

## 206. Sir Henry Hardinge to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Littleton, 11 December 1838.*—On my passage through town yesterday I met a friend of mine who had called upon Durham the day before.<sup>1</sup> He found him very savage agt. the Govt., & is very decidedly of opinion that the quarrel cannot be accommodated. Howick sides with M[elbourne].—Lord Grey with D.—whom he considers to have been very ill-treated by the Govt., altho' he cannot defend the Proclamation.<sup>2</sup>

D. said he should not go to Lambton immediately—for he found himself so bitterly attacked for leaving Canada on the eve of the rebellion breaking out, that he shd. take an opportunity of explaining that point to the public with the least possible delay. He said he had offered to remain if Colborne wished him, & that he had Colborne's letter thanking him for the offer, but recommending him to adhere to his original decision of returning home. He thinks he has a strong case agt. the Govt.—& they think his conduct wd. justify them (if they dared) to impeach him.

The Court I hear talk a coalition language—& Bonham & Chandos talk of dissensions & splits in the Cabinet of which I know & believe very little.

The state of the manufacturing districts is represented to be very bad. The addl. mily. force by augmenting the Comp. will not exceed 5000 men.

We can do nothing agt. Sir R. Donkin at Deal.<sup>3</sup> Dennison is dying, & if Chas. Barclay will stand, we shall carry the seat.<sup>4</sup>

And if Abercrombie resigns,<sup>5</sup> & Spring-Rice is the Whig candidate, & Goulburn ours, we stand a very good chance of seating G.—but when it comes to the point A. will probably not resign.

<sup>1</sup> He had reached England on 26 November

<sup>2</sup> On 9 October Durham issued a proclamation notifying the home government's disallowance of his ordinance of 28 June authorising the transportation to Bermuda of the leading Canadian rebels. At the same time he appealed from the government to public opinion, saying that whilst he had been governor-general of the Canadian provinces he had been 'exposed to incessant criticism' from home. He resigned his appointment and sailed from Canada on 1 November.

<sup>3</sup> Sir Rufane Donkin was elected for Sandwich on 12 February 1839.

<sup>4</sup> Charles Barclay and William Joseph Denison represented West Surrey in the 1835 parliament; Denison and G. J. Perceval in the 1837 parliament.

<sup>5</sup> Abercrombie resigned the speakership in May 1839 owing to ill health.

## 207. Sir Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Drayton Manor, 14 December [1838].*—I return to you the Duke of Wellington's letter. The Duke seems to know more of the opinion which prevails at Drayton Manor than I do. I have not the faintest conception of what he alludes to. Lord Francis Egerton<sup>1</sup> has not been here nor have I had the slightest communication with him. No one has been here since Lord Durham's return—except Shaw, the member for Dublin.<sup>2</sup> I have no reason to suppose that Lord Stanley would obstruct or object to any proceeding respecting Lord Durham that ought to be adopted. I never discussed with him the question of impeachment—but his letters are very hostile to Lord Durham & the course he has pursued.

In short I believe the only opinion I ever gave on this subject is the opinion which I expressed to you the other day—namely, that it would be unwise now to decide on the course to be pursued two months hence, & if it were decided, unwise to declare it. No decision could be taken without communication with such persons as Stanley, Graham, Follett, Pemberton, Lord F. Egerton and others, and I am convinced that to *write* to each would only provoke such varieties of opinion that no satisfactory conclusion could be drawn from them.

Every day brings some intelligence, or some report which (if well-founded) has a bearing on the question—at least which it is as well to know—before a decision that could not be acted on, until February, should be taken. I have a letter by this day's post from the Carlton to the following effect—

'Charles Buller has returned, and the language of the Radicals, we hear today, is that implacable hostility is declared between Lord Durham and the Ministers. They say that *the same day* the report on Brougham's Bill<sup>3</sup> reached Lord Durham by New York, he received a dispatch from the Government, approving *seriatim* of every paragraph in his ordinances, with a postscript, mentioning that a question had been raised as to their strict legality—but that upon conference with the Law Officers there appeared to be nothing in it.'

Lord Durham's conduct may have been so bad, so dangerous as an example—that there may be no alternative, consistently with honour and duty, but to make the attempt to punish or expose him, whatever be the result. The issue of his Proclamation is an undoubted fact—that, and the leaving his Government without the sanction of the Queen, are the heaviest charges against him—I *presume* the latter to be the case, and that he had no authority whatever to abandon his post.

But there are various questions which at least deserve mature consideration; for instance, should public inquiry into the facts precede any hostile

<sup>1</sup> Lord Francis Leveson-Gower assumed the surname Egerton in 1833 in consequence of inheriting the Bridgewater estates.

<sup>2</sup> University.

<sup>3</sup> A Bill of Indemnity, indemnifying those who had acted under Durham's illegal ordinance.

proceeding, or the menace of it? Suppose *Ld. Durham* himself to take the earliest opportunity of demanding inquiry both into his own conduct and into that of the Ministers—what bearing will a proceeding of this kind have upon the course we ought to pursue?

### 208. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*H. of Commons, 21 March 1839.*—I am greatly obliged by the kindness of your note.

Having undertaken at the request of Sir Robert Peel to make a motion in the Commons on the state of affairs in India, I feel the weight of the responsibility, and an anxious desire in the present critical state of our foreign relations, neither to say nor do anything, which may add at this moment to the national danger and embarrassment. In these circumstances I could not fail to look with the utmost deference to the opinion of the Duke of Wellington, who of all living men knows India best & is accustomed to take the most enlarged views, and to see coming dangers from afar. I ventured to express to *Hardinge* a wish that the Duke would see me before I made my motion, that I might be guided by his superior judgment with regard both to the points to be urged and the subjects to be avoided. I could not have presumed to expect that the Duke would take the trouble of writing on the subject, but I hoped that in conversation he might kindly have consented to correct my imperfect knowledge of this vast but most important matter. I shall fix the day of my motion for the 16th of April; so that ample time may be given for considering the terms of it and for carefully guarding my mode of treating it. If the Duke should prefer writing, my obligations will be very great, since no man before will ever have had the advantage of such a guide on so great a subject; but if when his Grace returns to town, he should choose to see me, the trouble to him may be less, the kindness to me almost the same.

I beg you will express to the Duke my grateful sense of his goodness in being thus willing to assist me: and if possible, this gratification is increased by the communication coming to me thro' you.<sup>1</sup>

*Ibid., Grosvenor Place, 5 April 1839.*—Since I returned home this evening I found on my table another number of the Indian Papers, which I send to make the set complete now in the hands of the Duke. The Foreign Office papers are still wanting. I confess, however, that the documents which I have read this evening and which I now send, do establish a case of strong suspicion against Russia, and afford proofs of an active meddling interference in various quarters on our Indian frontier hardly to be reconciled with amicable relations or the maintenance of good faith. Russia, however, may plead the example of *Ld. Ponsonby* in the case of *Circassia*, and the encouragement given by the British Ambassador to Mr. Bell: and even if the hostile designs of Russia be admitted, the question still remains, is the policy of Lord Auckland sound? Is the tripartite Treaty with *Shah Shooja* and *Runjeet Sing* the best mode of preparing Central Asia to resist an attack from the side of Persia?

<sup>1</sup> Graham made no motion on Indian affairs during the 1839 session.

Moreover there will still remain the most important question, have our negotiations with the Court of Persia been conducted with ordinary prudence? and has every effort been made to uphold our influence with the Shah, and to prevent a rupture, in effect equivalent to the establishment of Russian dominion at Tehran?

### 209. Horace Twiss to Charles Arbuthnot.

5 *Park Place*, 15 May 1839.—Sir H. Hardinge suggests it to me to ask you if you could be good enough to obtain for me a handbill addressed by William Cowper<sup>1</sup> to the Hertford electors, which Sir Henry says the Duke has. It is for the purpose of getting some comments upon it inserted in the *Times*, with one of whose leading writers I have just been in communication on the subject.

### 210. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Grosvenor Place*, 1 June 1839. *Private & Confidential*.—You kindly permitted me to write to you without reserve, whenever I thought that your interference might be useful for the removal of erroneous impressions. You will have read the report of the debate in the House of Lords last night.<sup>2</sup> I was present; and the Duke of Wellington's speech is fairly given in the *Times*. It has produced a great effect and given rise to much doubt and uncertainty among our friends at a juncture when a dissolution is impending, and when confidence is of primary importance. It was natural that the Duke should be anxious to disclaim all alliance or tacit understanding with Brougham, whose speech, tho' able, contained many passages at variance with the Duke's better feelings and principles; but in executing this purpose he probably went further than he originally intended, and protected Melbourne to an extent, of which at the moment he might hardly be aware. He acquitted Melbourne entirely, notwithstanding W. Cowper's Address, of anything like bad faith in the recent transactions at the Palace. This is matter of opinion, and the Duke's verdict is of immense value to Melbourne; but from so generous an opponent he was perhaps intitled to expect its avowal.

In the next place the Duke declared his opinion that Melbourne was not justified in resigning by the vote of the Commons on the Jamaica Bill.<sup>3</sup> This declaration from such an authority gives to the Ministers an immense advantage,

<sup>1</sup> William Cowper, Lord Melbourne's nephew and private secretary, was re-elected for Hertford on the 20th after appointment as a commissioner of Greenwich Hospital. Referring to the recent Bedchamber crisis he said 'Every dictate of feeling, of honour, of loyalty and justice, impels me, at all hazards, to support our Queen in her noble resistance to the cruel attempt so unworthily to wrest from her Majesty a prerogative hitherto unquestioned, and to usurp the power of dismissing at the Minister's will those ladies of her Court whom, from their sympathy and devotion, and from long acquaintance, her Majesty could look upon as friends.'

<sup>2</sup> On the recent Bedchamber crisis

<sup>3</sup> The bill to suspend the constitution of Jamaica for five years in consequence of the refusal of the local assembly to perform its functions. The government's majority fell to 5 on 6 May, and on the 7th the ministers resigned



of which Ld. Normanby was not slow to avail himself: it affords an answer to all our taunts of a self-condemned Administration returning to power by means of a Bedchamber intrigue, and narrows the objection to the course pursued to the single point of an error in judgment in abandoning office with too much alacrity, a venial offence compared with the charge to which hitherto they have been exposed.

This, however, being the Duke's opinion, once declared it is irrevocable; and had the matter rested here, I should not have written. But at the end of his speech the Duke told Melbourne emphatically that if he did his duty in Parliament as well as out of it, he might trust to the good sense of Parliament and of the people for support.<sup>1</sup>

Now this is conditional, and rests on the assumption that Melbourne will make an honest stand, and that he will resist the demands of the Radicals and the influence of O'Connell. But Melbourne in his speech, which was very vague, gave no such assurance: on the contrary there is reason to apprehend that a dangerous extension of the franchise is contemplated and the plan of education without religion is avowedly to be pressed. It is asked then, what are the wishes and intentions of the Duke? Is he prepared to grant to the present Ministers amnesty for the past? Does he think them intitled to support if they will only abstain for the present from dangerous measures, while their patronage & countenance is given to the most dangerous men? These are the doubts which fill the mind of every man who has read the report of the Duke's speech; and Macaulay's declaration in Edinburgh, that he stands as the supporter of Ld. Melbourne's Administration, yet pledges himself to support Ballot, a £10 franchise in counties and quinquennial Parliaments, has by no means served to diminish the alarm which the leniency evinced by the Duke towards Melbourne has naturally excited.

I know not whether the Duke may be disposed to remove this misapprehension and to take an early opportunity of marking his distrust in the policy and vague assurances of the Government; but it is right that I should tell you how matters stand, and what is the general impression left by last night's debate. It is probable that on Tuesday John Russell will make some declaration in the Commons respecting the County franchise and the rate-paying clauses. If a concession be made on these points, which are vital, might not the Duke at once declare his full sense of the danger and his abandonment of all hope or confidence in the professions of these Ministers?

I have troubled you at too great length; but you will appreciate my motives and pardon the frankness of a communication which your friendship has encouraged.

*Ibid.*, *H. of Commons*, 3 June 1839. *Private & Confidential*.—I am confirmed in my belief that Ld. J. Russell will tomorrow declare the determination of the Government to 'amend' the Reform Act. They will give up the necessity of continuous occupation and of the punctual payment of rates in towns, while in counties they will extend the franchise to £10 occupiers. I do not absolutely *know* this; but I am persuaded of the truth of what I write. They will

<sup>1</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, xlvii. 1187.

announce this decision, but postpone till another session the introduction of the Bill; and in the meantime they will agitate, work the registration and prepare for dissolution, if we beat them on the question of leave to introduce this fatal Bill, which is the death-warrant of the monarchy and of the landed interest. I am persuaded that Melbourne has yielded to his colleagues and is prepared with John Russell to go this length. If so, the Duke of Wellington has been deceived; and Melbourne's speech on Friday, tho' specious, was so carefully worded as not to be flagrantly inconsistent with the secret purpose of making these concessions. Warburton has been aware of some such intention for the last ten days: for he has assured the Radicals that if they would but remain quiet for a week they would be satisfied, and tomorrow his pledge will be redeemed.

All is lost if Ministers succeed in carrying this measure, and the *immediate* denunciation of it from the highest authority is of paramount importance. If Ministers avow their purpose in the Commons tomorrow, a strong declaration from the Duke in the Lords on *Wednesday* would produce the most salutary effect, or if not on Wednesday, on Thursday at the latest. Would it be impossible for you to come to town with Ld. Tweeddale on Wednesday morning? I am so convinced in my own mind, that the emergency will arise, that I am anxious, even at the risk of imposing on you a needless journey, to see you at Apsley House.

Your letter to the Duke discloses to him very fairly the feverish state of mind which exists among our friends. There is no feeling in any quarter inconsistent with the respect and deep attachment which the Duke can never cease to command; but there is an opinion that he has generously been disposed to give more credit to the enemy for good intentions and honest motives than facts corroborate or the event will justify. But the past is nothing compared with the future. Everything depends on the line taken by the Duke in the Lords, when the dangerous intentions, which I anticipate, are tomorrow openly declared. The best course, I think, you could take would be to come to London, unless your better judgment suggest some objection unknown to me: the next best would be to open to the Duke by letter as from yourself the view, which I have ventured to take, of the immense importance of an early declaration from him in the event of my anticipations being well-founded.

I will write to you tomorrow evening if possible from the House, and direct to you at Althorpe. . . . There is a rumor here that Parliament is to be dissolved on Friday. I do not believe it. But this does not affect tomorrow's declaration, or diminish the necessity of a manifesto from the Duke: on the contrary this necessity becomes more urgent.

*Ibid.*, *House of Commons*,  $\frac{1}{2}$  past 6 [4 June 1839].—John Russell is now speaking: he resists the introduction of Fleetwood's Bill<sup>1</sup>: he says the inclination of his mind is that the proposed addition to the County constituency would be an improvement, but he declines to *pledge* the Government

<sup>1</sup> For extending the £10 householder franchise qualification in the boroughs to the counties. The bill was defeated by 207 to 81.

at any future time to support this specific change. He has declared for an alteration in the system of registration,<sup>1</sup> and for the repeal of the clause which imposes the necessity of paying the assessed taxes as well as rates to constitute the right to vote. On the whole, the speech, tho' ambiguous and wavering, has not been of a Movement character, and the Duke *has not been deceived*. I do not think it *necessary* that you should come to town immediately; altho' your presence would not be by any means without its advantage.

*Ibid.*, Grosvenor Place, 5 June 1839. *Private*.—My letter of last night and the papers of today will have given you an accurate idea of the present state of affairs. It is clear that John Russell's individual opinion was in favor of the dangerous concession; and the refusal is due to Melbourne, and is restricted to *his* Cabinet. Great intrigues have taken place during the last week, and I am sure it was doubtful till the last moment whether Melbourne or the Movement would prevail. I thought it respectful to wait on the D. of Wellington this morning, and to acknowledge his superior foresight, and my own strong erroneous impression that Melbourne would have yielded. Hardinge accompanied me, and the Duke was kind as possible, in very good spirits, and entertaining a more favorable opinion of public affairs than he has done for some time. He said 'don't be in [a] hurry and all will come right; and when I complimented him on his never-failing sagacity, he said in his most characteristic manner, 'I never mind what I see; my life has been passed in finding out what they are doing *on the other side of the hill*': and on this occasion his secret information has been most accurate. Your own good judgment and prudence in this crisis have been exemplary and remarkable. It is much better that you did not come to London, and the tone of your letter to the Duke, as the event has turned out, was prudent and well-chosen in the highest degree. I of course in my conversation with the Duke, never alluded in the most remote manner to our correspondence. He did not appear offended with me; and I have had but one motive, to keep matters right in a moment of great excitement. The alarm has now passed away, and all is conjecture as to what these beaten Ministers can do. I really think we shall defeat them both on the Jamaica Bill and on the Canada Resolutions<sup>2</sup>; and if they dissolve at this moment, with the Wesleyans on our side and the Radicals exasperated against them, I really believe the return would be greatly in our favor. Nothing certain is yet known. Whenever I have anything worth your notice, I will write to you. Stanley is gone into Lancashire on private business of great importance for the remainder of the week. He never expressed an opinion or said one word at variance with the high respect and kind feeling he entertains towards the Duke. Peel made an admirable and most judicious speech yesterday, and scattered confusion in the ranks of the Radicals. . . .

<sup>1</sup> On the ground that the registration courts established by the 1832 Act often subjected voters whose rights were challenged by their political opponents, to an expensive and vexatious contest in the courts.

<sup>2</sup> Declaring that it was desirable to unite the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada 'on the principles of a free and representative Government'.

*Ibid.*, *H. of Commons*,  $\frac{1}{2}$  part 6, 7 June 1839.—The Ministers and the Radicals have come to terms thro' the intervention of Warburton and Ellice. Ballot is to be an *open* question; and Grote has just given notice for leave to bring in a Bill on Tuesday the 18th; John Russell is to introduce a new Registration Bill, which is really to be a new Reform Bill, containing all the alterations which he has announced his readiness to make, except the £10 occupiers' franchise in Counties. I heard this last night from good authority; and following your advice I called on the Duke this morning and told him what I had heard. He received me very kindly and communicated without reserve his opinion on the state of affairs. To have known him at all must ever be considered by me as an honorable circumstance in my life: to possess in the least degree his good opinion is an object of high ambition. When I wrote to you so earnestly, it was not without cause; and I had pressing reasons, but everything now stands as well as we could desire, saving always, if this base treaty between the Ministers and the Radicals be concluded, no strong expression of confidence in Melbourne would be either prudent or well deserved.

I have no time to add more.

*Ibid.*, *Grosvenor Place*, 8 June 1839. *Private*.— . . . The division in ballot on the 18th is considered important, since if it be made an open question, we shall see the relative strength of the two parties in the Government; and the concession of allowing it to be an open question cannot be regarded as consistent with good faith on the part either of Melbourne or John Russell.

In the meantime we are active in maturing our arrangements for a dissolution. The Conservative strength in South Lincolnshire is overpowering; yet it is represented by Handley, a Radical, and by Gil. Heathcote, who is a non-entity. I wish you could assist us by conferring with Charles Chaplin on the subject. Here we are disposed to think that *two* candidates should be started on our side at a general election. Young Tomline<sup>1</sup> is not indisposed to be one, if he would be acceptable: perhaps his name may not be popular, but he has the sinews of war. Could Sir John Trollope<sup>2</sup> be induced to stand with him; or how would Sir Thomas Whichcote do, who is about to marry Sir John Beckett's niece?<sup>3</sup> It has sometimes been thought that Ld. Maidstone might with propriety stand for S. Lincolnshire, and Mr. O'Brien take his place in Northamptonshire, but these changes are always dangerous, especially in Counties, and I would not recommend this experiment.<sup>4</sup> I conclude that nothing would tempt Charles Chaplin or any of his family to come forward; and the delay of Sir H. Fane's return from India prevents all hope of assistance from him.<sup>5</sup> Could you help us in this matter by communicating confidentially

<sup>1</sup> George Tomline, M.P. for Sudbury, June 1840. Sir George Pretymman Tomline (1750–1827), bishop of Winchester, was Pitt's tutor and biographer.

<sup>2</sup> M.P. for South Lincolnshire, July 1841.

<sup>3</sup> He was never in parliament.

<sup>4</sup> Augustus Stafford O'Brien succeeded Lord Maidstone as M.P. for Northamptonshire (North) at the 1841 election. Lord Maidstone was not in the commons after 1841.

<sup>5</sup> He died in March 1840 on his way home from India, after having resigned his office of commander-in-chief.

with Chaplin and ascertaining his wishes and opinion ? Our general preparations for a dissolution are far advanced and well arranged.

*Ibid.*, Grosvenor Place, 21 June 1839. *Private*.— . . . I partake entirely of the gloomy apprehensions which fill the mind of the Duke. This concession of Ballot and of education without religion to the importunities of the Radicals has failed already to satisfy them, but has undermined the foundations on which the Throne and the Altar rest. Our divisions in the Commons have been good, and remove all pressure of dangerous urgency from the Lords. We cannot, however, muster our forces in strength after next week, and Ministers will obtain that reprieve till another session, which is dearer to them than honor. In present circumstances they will not dissolve. I still think that a firm opinion expressed by the Duke of the danger which must ensue from making Ballot an open question, would produce a good effect, and might awaken some, who still slumber in false security, to a just sense of the coming evil. . . .

#### 211. Sir Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Whitehall*, 31 July [1839].— . . . We are in an extraordinary position, and I see no advance made towards the solution of the difficulties which existed in respect to the conduct of public affairs, present and future, when you were in London.

My firm belief is that the Government *wish* to keep Parliament sitting as long as they can, that the continuance of the session is a relief to them, giving them a participator in their responsibility, and an authority on the spot to be appealed to in case of necessity.

The extension of Chartism, the little influence possessed by the local magistrates in the particular confidence of the Government, most of whom were active encouragers of agitation while it suited their own personal or party objects—the unfavorable state of the weather and its probable effect on the harvest—the little aid which the Government derives from the Royal authority or popularity—all disincline the Ministers to part with Parliament—and to incur the risk of having to summon it again on account of increasing embarrassments accruing after the prorogation.

In a few days the Ministers will be in the House of Commons at the mercy of their Radical *supporters*. No concessions made by Ministers, no abandonment of Post Office revenue, has conciliated the Radicals.<sup>1</sup> They despise the Government. The Conservatives are fast departing and how the Government is to carry any one of the following important measures, now pending, I know not.

#### The Birmingham Police Bill.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The government on 5 July announced its intention of establishing the penny post

<sup>2</sup> In consequence of the Chartist riots in Birmingham, the government announced its intention of establishing an efficient police force in the town, and of loaning a sum of £10,000 for the purpose, the money to be repaid out of the rates. A bill was also passed enlarging the powers of the magistrates for appointing county and district constables, to be maintained out of local rates.

The new Rural Police Bill.

The Bank of Ireland Bill containing, like 1844, the monopoly of the Bank.

It is said Rice is to retire, but I can hardly believe that a Chancellor of the Exchequer intending to withdraw himself from the responsibility, would have acted the part which Rice has done with respect to the Post Office revenue.<sup>1</sup>

Some think that Paulett Thompson is to succeed Rice in case of his retirement—others that Paulett Thompson wishes to go as Dictator to Canada.<sup>2</sup> Leopold, I believe, is certainly coming in the course of the month of August. There is a seeming improvement in the intercourse between the Queen and the Duchess of Kent, probably owing to the absence of Conroy. . . .<sup>3</sup>

## 212. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Netherby, 12 September 1839. Private.*—Altho' I am greatly obliged by the trouble which you have taken in sending me the copy of your letter to Peel, yet I can assure you that no false impression was harboured by me : for on the one hand I know well the pushing forwardness of Brougham, which is not easily rebuffed ; and on the other I have learnt duly to appreciate the considerate kindness and good taste of the Duke, which would restrain him from exercising his own judgment or giving effect to his own wishes, if thereby his guest were to be placed in a painful and degraded position.<sup>4</sup> All this I could well understand without explanation ; but your letter makes the matter clear. The only subject of regret is the false impression produced on the public mind for the moment, which, in ignorance of the real facts, might be led to imagine that Brougham was gaining on the favor and confidence of the Duke : and in my full reliance on his discernment of character, I am gladly checked by my recollection of former intercourse with Brougham from stating my opinion of the danger of confidence reposed in his honor, his principles, or even his support. The Duke's answer to Brougham's eulogium proved that he had formed a just estimate, and that his heart, which is warm in attachment to tried friends, is not open to the fawning of insidious flatterers. As to Burdett's speech, the folly and bad taste of violating the rule, which excluded party politics, are flagrant ; but my friend, who was present at the dinner and from whom I heard in Scotland, mentioned that this speech was *most* applauded, when it transgressed the rule and poured contempt on a Government upheld by Court intrigue, for the purpose of drawing the inference, that in this splendid assemblage of persons drawn together without distinction of party, a feeling adverse to Ministers prevailed,

<sup>1</sup> Spring-Rice resigned the chancellorship of the exchequer at the close of the session and became Lord Montague.

<sup>2</sup> In August, too, Poulett Thomson accepted the post of governor-general of Canada.

<sup>3</sup> It was generally believed that the duchess of Kent had formed a *liaison* with Sir John Conroy, her private secretary and comptroller of her household.

<sup>4</sup> At a banquet given in Wellington's honour at Dover on 30 August, Brougham eulogised the duke in the most extravagant terms.

and that a good omen of the real state of the public mind might be formed from this outbreak of political sentiment.

I quite agree in your opinion of the Manchester contest.<sup>1</sup> I have a sincere regard for Sir George Murray: from particular circumstances he is unhappy and unfortunate, and it is wrong to comment with harshness on his struggles for success amidst great difficulties. He is, however, better suited to the Horse Guards than to popular assemblies: for when pressed he makes dangerous concessions to political adversaries, and wants that high courage of resistance in the conflict of opinion, which so eminently distinguishes him in the field. In revolutionary times, and on them our lot is cast, the surrender of first principles is the greatest of all dangers: to have carried Manchester would have been a poor recompense for the loss of the vantage ground on which we have hitherto defended the existing Corn Law and the amended Poor Law: to have lost Manchester and gratuitously to have weakened these defences is indeed a misfortune: and I hope that Sir George Murray will renounce his temptations which these popular constituencies hold out to the ruin of a man, who is not resolved to make no concession for the purpose of winning their favor.

I was much struck by the circumstance of Leopold not landing at Ramsgate: it appeared clear to me, that either of his own accord, or yielding to the wish of others, he avoided an interview with the Duke, before he saw the Queen. I augur ill from this precaution: and I see that the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge have not invited the Castle since the arrival of Leopold. All this is demonstrative of rooted aversion to any one not allied to Melbourne, and until the Ministerial majority be broken down in the H. of Commons, no good whatever can be effected. Normanby's appointment to the Home Office is a studied insult to the H. of Lords, to the judges and the magistracy, and an act of base submission to O'Connell, who demanded that Ebrington,<sup>2</sup> with whom he is dissatisfied, should be placed *under* Normanby. Paulet Thompson's appointment is condemned by all parties without exception, and angrily renounced, as you see, by Edward Ellice. This and the *Monteagle*!! job, with the secession of Howick<sup>3</sup> and the indignation of Ld. Grey, have made the Administration even weaker than it was at the end of the session, but the more it depends on the favor of the Queen, the more resolutely will she put forth all the power of her prerogative to uphold it; and I fear that no hope can any longer be entertained resting on the scruples and honor of Melbourne, who ought not to endanger the Crown for the gratification of his own ambition. I really think that a dissolution of Parliament on the new Register, which comes into operation in November, would give to the Conservatives a considerable majority: and altho' this experiment of a dissolution is a fearful one, I see no other means so safe or constitutional of bringing back the Crown to an accordance with the aristocracy and with and [*sic*] the elective body as now constituted.

<sup>1</sup> R. H. Greg was returned for Manchester on the 7th at a by-election caused by Poulett Thomson's appointment as governor-general of Canada

<sup>2</sup> Lord-lieutenant of Ireland.

<sup>3</sup> Chiefly because he was dissatisfied with Normanby's transference from the colonial to the home office.

I have not heard from Peel or Stanley since the end of the session. I have had nothing to trouble them with; and they have had nothing to communicate.

The Chartist feeling is strong among a certain portion of the manufacturing classes; but I consider it less formidable, since I came into the country, than when I heard only reports of it in London. At Carlisle the Town Council have refused to make an addition to the municipal police, which Ld. J. Russell recommended; and the Government has at the same time removed a squadron of cavalry from Carlisle, because there are no horse barracks; and Ministers, admitting their necessity, refuse to build them. In these circumstances I have declined taking an active part in bringing the new County Constabulary Act into execution here; thinking it hard to devolve on the County Rate, thus unaided, the whole expense of maintaining the public peace. It is well, however, that we have that Act in reserve on the Statute Book; no Conservative Government could have passed it. I was rejoiced to see the Duke mark strongly his disapprobation of the appointment of Chartist Magistrates by John Russell: the Bolton case was outrageous: it is almost a ground of impeachment, were it not dangerous to let loose this chained lion in the angry struggle of balanced Parties.<sup>1</sup>

### 213. Sir Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Drayton Manor, 8 November [1839].*—I am much obliged to you for sending me a copy of Mr. Copland's very sensible letter.

The devil himself could have contrived nothing better to sow the seed of permanent discord in Canada than the sending such a man as Lord Durham. He made his report to spite the Government, and did not hesitate to risk the loss of the Canadas by obstructing any safe settlement of the questions relating to them—and in order that he might gratify his own love of popularity—and desire to be revenged on the Government which had not supported him.

What a shameful affair the whole is. The Government send a notoriously unfit man, in order to get rid for a time of a troublesome opponent or a more troublesome friend. They send him to the very place where his Radical opinions and connections are likely to be the most mischievous, and inflict irreparable evil upon the country, in order to purchase a few months repose from this fellow's intrigues and complaints. He repays them in their own coin—neither one party or the other caring for the public interests.

They made Lord Durham formidable by giving him authority in such a country as Canada—and in such a crisis of its affairs.

Frost, the Chartist leader at Newport, is another and similar specimen of their misdoings on a small scale. Frost is at Newport what Lord Durham is to Canada. The Government make this Frost a *magistrate*—give him the

<sup>1</sup> The Chartist mayor of Bolton had been appointed a justice of the peace. 'We must put an end', said the Duke, 'to this system of employing men as magistrates for the maintenance of the peace, who have been concerned in its violation' (*Parl Deb*, 3rd series, l. 432 [20 August])



influence and authority which belong to his official station—and think they can repair the mischief by dismissing him when his language and acts become intolerable.<sup>1</sup> He retaliates as Lord Durham did, and with the same reckless disregard of consequences.<sup>2</sup> There was this difference, to be sure, that Lord Durham ran away.

I wrote to Croker to ask him what share he had in the article on British policy.<sup>3</sup> I enclose his letter.

The Quarterly Review, under the auspices of Croker, has been hitherto the loudest in deprecating any violent opposition to the Government, & has taken the most desponding tone. A crack-brained fellow like Sir Francis Head can induce them completely to alter it and to attack those whom they [have] been counselling to forbearance and almost to inaction, for not having been in a state of feverish excitement and activity.

The Government, I hear, is as uncomfortable as it well can be. Palmerston is himself the author of those attacks which you may see occasionally in the Morning Chronicle on the present Government and policy of France. The prospects of the Government, unless indeed such people as Mr Bradshaw<sup>4</sup> brighten them for them, must be gloomy enough. . . .<sup>5</sup>

*Ibid.*, Drayton Manor, 17 November [1839].— . . . The Queen left us on Thursday morning—I hope and believe pleased with her visit. She seemed to think that the marriage would take place. . . .<sup>6</sup> Queen Adelaide wrote to the Queen from Drayton, so that I trust they are on good terms. The Queen is not well advised in shewing such especial favour to two such men as Lord Melbourne and Lord Palmerston. It is not quite seemly in a maiden Queen. She may not know their characters—but they must know their own—and it would be but generous in them not to exhibit themselves so incessantly as objects of the Royal favour.

#### 214. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Apsley House*, 26 November 1839.— . . I find there is great anger at the Queen's not saying anything about Protestantism in the announcement of her marriage.

<sup>1</sup> See *Annual register*, 1839, *Chron*, pp 22–6, for Frost's correspondence with Lord John Russell, the home secretary.

<sup>2</sup> On the 4th Frost led a Chartist mass attack on Newport, Monmouthshire. He was subsequently found guilty of levying war against the queen and was sentenced to death on 16 January 1840, but on 1 February the sentence was commuted for one of transportation for life.

<sup>3</sup> *Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1839, pp 462–512. Peel had attributed the authorship to Sir Francis Head (Parker's *Peel*, ii. 409).

<sup>4</sup> For his outrageous attack upon the queen in a public speech at Canterbury on 20 October, see *Ann. reg.*, 1839, *Hist of Europe*, p. 311. Bradshaw was Tory M.P. for that city.

<sup>5</sup> The remainder of the letter is in Parker's *Peel*, ii. 368, where it is wrongly dated 1838. Line 3, read 'authors'; 4th paragraph, read 'this' instead of 'the'; lines 3–4, read and a small majority in the house of commons'.

<sup>6</sup> She had already accepted prince Albert on 15 October. The marriage took place on 10 February 1840.

She is very unpopular. At the theatres there have been sentiments and expressions about Royal marriages (in the plays I mean) & they have not created the slightest sensation. I don't believe her choice is liked. It is thought we have had already too much of the Cobourgs. The marriage has been settled a very long time, but was kept a profound secret, & particularly from the Duchess of Kent.<sup>1</sup> Don't mention this. I know this to be the fact. . . .

### 215. Sir Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Drayton Manor, 8 December* [1839].—. . . I send you one from Croker, part of which relates to the article on British policy in the last Quarterly. He wrote to me some days since requesting hints for a future article—I told him I would give him none—for I thought his Quarterly Review had behaved in a most unaccountable and indefensible manner—that up to the last number the tone of the Quarterly was, even unwisely, desponding—and that the advice uniformly given in the Quarterly was to maintain a defensive attitude, and to check—but not assail, the Government. I quoted the following passage in my letter to him, and asked him how it was possible to reconcile the spirit of that passage and a hundred others of which this is an example, with the temper & spirit of the article on British Policy [*sic*].

After speaking of the dangers of the country the Quarterly asks, 'What and where is the remedy? *We*, at least, think it will not be found in any rash and violent advance on the part of the Conservative forces. *We* believe, on the contrary, that by taking up a defensive and essentially conservative position in both Houses of Parliament, the Duke of Wellington, Sir Robert Peel &c. may do much, and more than can be done, by any other system, towards the great object of wise and good men in every political crisis. *Ne quid detrimenti respublica capiat.*' '*We* are satisfied that the Fabian system *cunctando restituit rem* is most efficacious.'

There are twenty other sentences to the same effect in the same article from which this above was taken. I said I could have no respect for an oracle which, at the instigation of such a foolish vain fellow as Sir Francis Head—retracted all that it had said, and abused those who had not followed its advice, but from their own sense of what was right—had acted upon the principles of which it previously was the most strenuous advocate. The enclosed is the rejoinder to my letter. I think, however, notwithstanding the '*indignation*', Brougham, Burdett, Head & Co. have had their influence on Croker.

I think Sir John Macdonald's letter is a very serious affair. He has had the folly of laying down principles vastly more comprehensive than the case with which he had to deal—what could be the use of establishing it as a military maxim that no officer on *any pretence whatever* is to attend a political meeting? The doctrine without qualification and exceptions is perfectly indefensible. Not content with the special case wherein he had to deal with regimental

<sup>1</sup> The queen announced her engagement in various letters to members of the royal family, written on the 15th.

officers in actual employment on the spot, and in an easily excited neighbourhood where it might be prudent at least, to abstain from attending a party meeting—Sir John extends the rule to the officers of the army at large—under all imaginable circumstances. May not a half-pay captain stand a contested election—or may not he be present at his brother's election dinner?

Then to pass a severe reprimand upon men on such a ground as this—'that they were at a meeting, at which expressions were uttered which they *are unprepared to prove the propriety of* towards the person of their Sovereign'. The language is as absurd as the sentiment.

I think Col. Thomas ought not to have listened without remonstrance to the language imputed to Mr. Roby—and that Lord Hill had a fair right to ask him whether he heard the offensive expressions—and if he did, to censure him for not remonstrating or for remaining in the room. But after men deny that they heard the expressions—they take upon themselves as gentlemen the consequences of the denial (if it be not consistent with truth) but to reprimand them after the denial, for *not being able to prove the propriety of the expressions*—is ridiculous.

It seems to me that the whole letter of Sir John is a most bungling one—where a proper letter either peremptorily requiring a denial of having heard disloyal or offensive expressions, or conveying rebuke if they were heard, would have been very easily devised. But I recollect Sir John as Mily. Secretary to Lord Hopetown<sup>1</sup> in Ireland, fagging himself to death with making business, and inflating trifles into things of serious moment—so I am not much surprised.

## 216. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Netherby, 13 December 1839. Private.*—I am delighted by your account of the Duke's health, and no less by your assurance that at last he is willing to take some care. He is prodigal of that life which all, except himself, regard as invaluable; and I quite agree with Ld. Spencer, tho' from him the sentiment is strange, that on the eve of Waterloo the nation had not a deeper interest in the life of the Duke of Wellington than at the present eventful moment.

Higher praise was never bestowed on any man than in the words with which you describe the constant motives of his public conduct, 'he looks solely to what is right and to the justice of the case'. This can with truth be said of few politicians: I believe it in the Duke's case, and I revere him because I believe it.

What I said in my last letter on the question of a separate establishment and Household to be assigned to the husband of the Queen proceeded from no narrow view of temporary expediency or of the transient interests of party, but from a strong constitutional doubt whether such an irresponsible and immoveable influence, planted in the Palace yet uncontrolled by the Sovereign, be reconcileable with the future dignity and power of the Crown, and the safe conduct of public affairs. Precedent must have weight in determining such a question; and I was anxious that the course taken with respect to the

<sup>1</sup> Lord Hopetoun was commander-in-chief in Ireland in 1812.

establishment of Prince George of Denmark on Queen Ann's accession should be ascertained; for tho' I find that a large provision <sup>1</sup> was made for him in the event of his surviving the Queen, I cannot find, in my limited researches here, any trace of a separate Household, or of great officers of State permanently attached to his person. The question would seem to involve deliberations of high importance: I was only anxious to open it, and I shall be disposed to adopt any opinion which the Duke and Peel form after full investigation of precedents and a careful consideration of the subject in all its bearings.

My attention has long been directed to the Church Patronage question in Scotland. It is impossible to overestimate its importance, or to overlook the danger of its present position. An open rupture now exists between the State & Kirk; and the war of pamphlets inflames the heat with which religious feuds have ever been imbittered in Scotland. I am reading Mr. Hope,<sup>2</sup> and an answer <sup>3</sup> from Dr. Chalmers in some 150 pages is lying on my table. When it was proposed to me last year that I should be chosen Ld. Rector of the University of Glasgow,<sup>4</sup> I carefully guarded myself on this particular point; and I declared, that I was opposed to the popular veto as granted by the General Assembly in 1834; and that I declined the honor, if any compromise of my opinion on this point were required. Notwithstanding this avowal on my part, I have been twice elected after a contest. The clergy are much divided in opinion: the Evangelical party, with Dr. Chalmers at their head, is prepared to secede from the Establishment, if a law be not passed confirming the veto, which the Courts of Law have declared to be an innovation. This secession from the Establishment will be union with the Voluntaries; from thence to Chartism there is but one step; and history reminds us of the fatal effects of the combination of such combustible materials as Scotch Dissent and Scotch Republicanism. The lower classes, flushed with the recent acquisition of political power, and influenced by religious zeal and lust of patronage, are generally disposed to make common cause with the Evangelical clergy and to contend for the popular veto, which they have now enjoyed for 5 years. The aristocracy generally, and a large majority of the gentry, are disposed to resist what they regard as an encroachment proceeding from a spirit of democracy in alliance with clerical ambition. This contest, if pushed to extremities, will bring into dispute the first principles of Presbyterian Church Government, in which the democratic principle is deeply embodied; and if no accommodation of this unhappy difference be possible, Scotland will be torn asunder by a religious strife, not less angry and far more dangerous than that which ruins Ireland; and as relates to the Conservative Party in Scotland, this quarrel, if protracted, will be fatal. The controversy has now assumed so angry an aspect, that I have little hope of any reasonable adjustment; and amidst the many dangers, which threaten us on every side, I know none which I regard

<sup>1</sup> £100,000 a year.

<sup>2</sup> *A letter to the Lord Chancellor on the claims of the Church of Scotland in regard to its jurisdiction, and on the proposed changes in its polity.* By John Hope (Edinburgh, 1839)

<sup>3</sup> *Remarks on the present position of the Church of Scotland.* (Glasgow, 1839.)

<sup>4</sup> See Parker's *Graham*, 1 272-4.

with more apprehension or which I consider so urgent as this Veto question. I am very glad that the Duke is considering it. Ld. Aberdeen understands it thoroughly ; and if any settlement can be effected, it will be thro' him. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Netherby*, 14 December 1839.—I am sincerely obliged by your kind confidence, which I hope never to abuse. I return Sir R. Peel's letter under another cover. The comments made by Sir Francis Head in his article in the *Quarterly* on the conduct of the Conservative Party were flippant and offensive ; and I am not surprised that Peel resents the provocation. It is easy to be bold without any share of responsibility ; it is easier still to find fault and to criticize after the event, but were the game to be played over again, I know not a mistake, which I could wish rectified in the great outline of our parliamentary policy , and the present position of the Church in Ireland, which enjoys comparative security and repose with an income well paid and well protected, is a signal triumph of honest opposition to iniquitous designs, and is not only an example of the wisdom and firmness of Peel and the Duke, but an encouragement to persevere under adverse circumstances in the steady course, which conscience, sense of right, and sound principles point out as the path of duty.

I read with regret the letter of the Adjutant General.<sup>1</sup> I think that Col. Thomas and his officers acted unwisely in attending a Party dinner in a disturbed district, when their services might at any moment be required to aid the civil power in preserving the public peace. The language also of Col. Thomas in there referring to the wrongs of the soldier was imprudent and unjustifiable ; and it is probable that Mr. Roby used expressions with reference to the Court, which were unguarded and open to misconstruction ; but I quite agree with Peel, that the reprimand opens a much larger question, which it is difficult to define, and dangerous to discuss, viz. how far the rights of a citizen are suspended by the duties of an officer. In the present state of affairs it is not prudent to launch this topic, which will now not only be discussed at every mess table, but be forced into parliamentary debate. The respect and consideration justly due to Lord Hill prescribe great caution in dealing with this subject, but the doctrine of military abstinence from political interference comes with a strange grace from an Administration which has prostituted the Navy, and its honors and even employment, on the base reward of ribaldry on the hustings or of services at elections.

The letter from your son is very interesting, and I am greatly obliged to you for allowing me to read it. It proves how narrow was our escape from defeat in Caubul : and a serious reverse in the centre of Asia would have shaken to its foundations our Indian Empire. Rashness will receive the reward of wisdom ; and an escape from ruin will be regarded as a feat of policy ; so capricious is fortune, and so blind is the discrimination of mankind !! But it [is] not so with the all-seeing eye. We are told, ' not to be envious of the evil-doer, and that the thing that is right, brings a man peace at the last '. How this is illustrated by the peep which is given to us into the bosom of O'Connell. He longs for rest, and can find none except within the walls

<sup>1</sup> See No. 215.

of a monastery. He is set on a slippery place, and his fall or flight are inevitable: the eyes of millions are fixed on him, and shouts of acclamation will greet his fall. Contrast this with the closing glory of the life which you so much admire and see so near at hand. What peace! What resignation! How joyful the recollection of past services; how proud the anticipation of future fame. How easy it must be to die in the conscious sense of duty faithfully discharged and in the fervent hope of atoning mercy. It is the reflection on such a contrast, which leads one to exclaim 'Verily there is a reward for the righteous, doubtless there is a God who judgeth the earth.'

I am almost ashamed to have obtruded on you thoughts like these; but they have flowed naturally: I have not suppressed them, and you will pardon me.

*Ibid.*, Grosvenor Place, 26 January 1840. *Private*.—No one regrets more deeply or sees more clearly than I do all the evil consequences which will probably flow from our fatal disunion on the Privilege question: but thinking Peel right in the main, and having voted with him in 1837 and last year, I was bound to support him, and I still venture to hope that by legislative interference the present difficulties may be removed.<sup>1</sup>

It certainly is most painful to differ from the Duke of Wellington and to be driven into concert with O'Connell and the lowest Radicals at a moment when the tide of democracy is at its height, and when any popular impulse aggravates the danger of the movement: but it fortunately happens that the popular feelings run counter to privilege; and if honestly we could have taken the opposite course, we should have destroyed the Administration. As it is, we have saved them; and judging from the elections, which have disappointed me, I am not sure that we have reason to regret their escape. I called on the Duke yesterday: but knowing his strong feeling on the Privilege question, and fearing that nothing which I could say would be satisfactory, I avoided the subject, and consulted him only on the proposed grant to Prince Albert.

He was very kind and explicit, and I found with pleasure that Peel had taken *his advice* on this subject the day before.

I am willing to believe that the vote on this grant and on Sir J. Buller's motion<sup>2</sup> will restore that unanimity to the Party, which the events of the last week have disturbed. We propose to vote £30,000 a year absolutely to Prince Albert for his life, and £50,000 a year in the event of his surviving the Queen, and of his being the father of Royal issue. I think this a fair and ample settlement; and I believe that we shall carry it.<sup>3</sup> What course the Government will take, if beaten, I cannot foretell. I doubt their dissolving,

<sup>1</sup> In an action brought in 1836 by Stockdale, the printer, against Messrs Hansard for publishing alleged libellous matter, the court of queen's bench had given judgment for the plaintiff, setting aside the plea that Parliament had authorized the publication. The whigs, in maintaining parliament's authority, were supported by Peel and Graham, but opposed by Wellington and many other Tories.

<sup>2</sup> On the 28th he brought forward a motion of no confidence in the government. It was rejected by 308 to 287.

<sup>3</sup> They did so, by 262 to 158, on the 27th. The government accepted this defeat, abandoning its own proposal of a grant of £50,000 a year.

tho' the elections of the last week will encourage them. My belief is, they will submit to the defeat and accept the reduced allowance, leaving the wound to rankle in the Royal bosom, and fomenting the enmity.

On Buller's motion we shall be defeated by a majority of 15, but it is said that they will be driven to move the previous question!! and if so, they will have little reason to triumph. Having commenced the system of aggression we must not flinch but follow it up, and expose and attack in detail their various delinquencies. This treason affair is by no means ended; and either the pardon or the execution of Frost will be very embarrassing to them. We have a strong case against the Attorney Genl. for his whole conduct of these trials.

I consider your letter very kind and am most grateful for it. I am always glad to know your opinion, which I regard with sincere respect; and very often an early intimation from you enables me to do good or to prevent mischief: but on this occasion matters had gone too far, and to recede is impossible. We must endeavour to keep matters straight for the future, and I hope cordial agreement on all other points may cast into the shade this unhappy difference.

I have not named your letter to anyone, and I consider it most confidential. The Duke's opinion, however, on the subject is generally known. I hope you will come to London before long. I think your presence might be useful. . .

*Ibid.*, Grosvenor Place, 3 February 1840. *Private*.—I am very much gratified by your letter, and pleased that you should think I have rendered service to the cause. On the whole I was of opinion that it was necessary to make the motion;<sup>1</sup> and having advised it I was anxious as to the result. The division might have been better; yet it proves that out of the whole House, with every possible combination against us, the majority in favor of Ministers does not exceed 18. I think that the declarations of Ld. Howick and Mr. Ward amply compensate us for the division. Ld. Howick announces that he has been for some time aware of the Radical tendency of the Government, which, as far as the constitution of the H. of Commons is concerned, he is resolved to resist; and perhaps this warning may produce some effect on the moderate Whigs. Mr. Ward is still more explicit, and says that our facts are his facts, our objections his vindication: that what we dread he desires; that what we seek to avert he labours to accomplish: that Ballot and democratic change are the objects, and open questions *the certain means*; and that on these grounds, which have been conceded, his support is given to the Ministers. This surely cannot be misunderstood: he who runs may read; and if this warning be neglected by the country, and if property in self-defence be not roused into activity, the days of the Monarchy are numbered.

I think that Peel is quite aware of the absolute necessity of active warfare, and I believe some notices of motions will be given this evening. Herries also makes a motion on Finance tomorrow, to which I attach great importance, especially since Ld. John has declared his intention of asking us for fresh taxes and increased estimates.

<sup>1</sup> Buller's motion, of which Graham spoke in support on the 29th (*Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, li. 787).

I saw the Duke on Friday, venturing again to call on him ; and the kindness of his reception gives me every encouragement to repeat my visits. The conclusion of Peel's speech, in which he referred to the character of the Duke, which is our tower of strength, and to the honor of his long and intimate connection with him, was beautifully executed, and has left a good impression.<sup>1</sup> I am sure it would please you, and I hope it was acceptable to the feelings of the Duke. Our only chance of safety consists in the cordial union of such men. . . .

#### 217. Lord Cowley to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Grosvenor St., 11 February 1840.*— . . [Wellington]. In Parliament his delivery is slower than ever—but his voice is strong, & the substance of his speeches full of good sense, information, & knowledge of his subject. He is more disposed to attack the Govt. than he used to be, and is sometimes very severe upon them. I cannot, however, say that I think our affairs are mending. In the House of Commons many days at the beginning of the session were occupied by that foolish question of privilege, so that no question of importance to the country & to the Conservatives was brought forward. I confess I am sorry that Sir Robert Peel has taken so decided a part upon the question of privilege, for it is very unpopular in the country, & so much so in the City that the Govt. is in constant dread of insurrections in favor of the poor Sheriffs. The affair must at last be settled (if it can be settled) by a declaratory Bill. . . .

The Queen was a good deal cheered yesterday upon going to church & returning to the Palace—but I hear from an eye witness that upon leaving Buckingham Palace for Windsor, although great crowds were assembled, not a cheer was heard—and I hear from another person that the people were equally silent on her passing through Kensington. She had certainly resolved not to invite the D. of W[ellington] to the wedding—but Melbourne told her that there were some things the people of England would bear, and some that they would not—and that if she did not invite the Duke, she might depend upon it, some disagreeable consequences would follow. . . .

#### 218. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Grosvenor Place, 1 June 1840. Private.*—I know not that I should have written urging you to come to London, if I had not heard from Lady Burghersh that you were hesitating and only half resolved to renew your visit to Apsley House.

I foresee very serious difficulty with respect to the Canada Bill. It is a dangerous measure, and the Duke foresees such fatal consequences from its adoption, that he cannot reconcile acquiescence in it to his sense of duty. On the other hand, Peel, while he admits the danger, is disposed to leave the whole weight of the responsibility accumulated on the Government, and not to incur a still heavier portion by rejecting their measure, while as an Opposition we

<sup>1</sup> See *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, li. 1049 (31 January).



are unable to give effect to a better policy of our own. To enter at length on this subject would be fruitless in a letter, but the misfortune is that the Duke and Peel do not communicate, and I am afraid that the line taken in the two Houses on this important subject will be at variance. There is also a new Club<sup>1</sup> about to be formed, an off-shoot from the Carleton, from which I anticipate great mischief and a serious schism in the Conservative ranks. All this is most unfortunate, when we are on the verge of success and when at any moment our victory may be decisive. I know not that you would be able to remove any difficulty, yet it would be a comfort that at the critical juncture you should be present, when your advice and assistance might be available. Nothing decisive can be expected this week, when everybody will be at Epsom, when Stanley is absent on account of Lady Skelmersdale's approaching death,<sup>2</sup> and when the great struggle respecting Irish Registration is postponed to Thursday s'e night. The Whitsuntide adjournment will only be from Friday next to Tuesday the 9th. If you can come therefore either on that day or on Wednesday the 10th you will be here at the moment of greatest urgency: but in the meantime the Canada Bill will pass the Commons, and I am afraid that Peel and the Duke have no understanding whatever on the subject.

On the Irish Bill also there is some difficulty; but this does not press so immediately, for I believe the debate on the next stage of Stanley's Registration Bill will *precede* the further progress of the Municipal Bill in the Lords: and if we have another majority in the Commons, some decisive result may be anticipated. With respect to Canada, we shall become pledged to a line of policy; and if the Duke and Peel should appear before the public not acting in unison on a matter of such primary importance, the worst effect will be produced and any other advantage which we may gain will be more than counterbalanced.

I shall still hope to see you next week. The absence of Stanley from London is most unfortunate.

*Ibid.*, Grosvenor Place, Friday morning, [12 June 1840].—I would gladly have called on you, but I must meet Peel and Stanley at  $\frac{1}{2}$  past 11, and at 2 we go up to the Queen with the Address<sup>3</sup> from both Houses.

Our position is most tantalising. The Government sustained the most severe defeat they have yet experienced: having reunited their forces with Howick & Charles Wood under a shabby pretext, which enabled all the loose camp-followers to vote with them, they sustained a signal rout, and we had a majority of 11.<sup>4</sup> We should have defeated them a second time by a larger majority, but tho' the main body voted with O'Connell, the Ministers voted with us and thus masked their minority. We have fixed Monday for our order of the day, intending to *force it* in preference to any Government measure; and thus, if we succeed, virtually deposing them.

But all this is lost labor, if Peel and the Duke be not reunited; for while

<sup>1</sup> The Conservative Club.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Stanley had married her daughter Emma in 1825.

<sup>3</sup> Congratulating her on her escape from assassination.

<sup>4</sup> On the Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill, on the 11th.

we endeavour to mitigate minor evils and to avert more distant dangers, this disunion, once made known, scatters to the winds the Conservative Party, renders a Conservative Government *impossible*, and gives a decisive victory, which can never be repaired, to anarchy, to the Movement and to the common enemy, whom we have now all but vanquished and by *our union* have checked so successfully.

In public life I have often been disappointed ; but I never knew a misfortune so fatal and so unexpected as this.

*Ibid.*, *H. of Commons*, 30 June 1840. *Private*.— . . My belief is that the Union Bill will pass, the Duke satisfying his conscience by placing on record his solemn protest. In the meantime the Government is negotiating with the Archbishop on the subject of the Clergy Reserves ; and partly from their weakness, partly from their earnest desire to pass some *one* Government measure in the course of the present session. In such circumstances I am willing to hope that Ld. John may be found not unwilling to treat on reasonable terms : and in my opinion this part of the subject is the most critical and dangerous.

I called on the Duke on Sunday and was received very kindly by him. Your prognostications will come right : no serious differences, I am certain, can arise among men who act with an honest purpose on the same principles, and mutually respect and esteem each other. I sincerely wish that Peel would hold more constant and familiar intercourse with the Duke , and I am sure that if he did, a moment's misunderstanding would be impossible.

The Government will hasten to an early prorogation : but they will not be able by an adverse majority to extinguish Stanley's Bill. We may be unable to pass it, but its principle stands confirmed by repeated majorities in the H. of Commons. This with a view to future legislation is an immense advantage. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Grosvenor Place*, 9 July 1840.—Altho' we have escaped from the immediate and extreme danger of our position, yet I am afraid that we are seriously damaged and that seeds of disunion are sown, of which the fruit will be bitterness and dissension. The sooner the session now terminates the better : and calm reflection during the recess and the turn of new events may restore the powerful influence of common principles and of former confidential intercourse.

It should not be forgotten that the Clergy Reserve question is intimately connected with the Canada Union Bill : and surely we have obtained most excellent terms for the Established Church. The Archbishop of Canterbury indeed has dictated the settlement to the Government, who, in their desire to pass in this session some one measure of a comprehensive character, have yielded an unwilling assent to an arrangement highly favorable to the Church and opposed to the principles of their supporters. The proceeds of past sales are secured to the Churches of England and Scotland, and guaranteed by an equivalent charge on the Consolidated Fund of Gt. Britain. Our half of the Clergy Reserves yet unsold is appropriated to these churches : the dispute between the Church of England and that of Scotland is adjusted : provision is made for other Christian sects in the colony without any specific enactment

in the Imperial Parliament, which might involve the admission of dangerous principles: and *the whole* of the Reserves will be sold, thus removing a great obstruction to the general improvement of the Province and the source of religious discord and perpetual heart-burning. Surely to have obtained these terms from a reluctant and hostile Government is no ordinary triumph: and this settlement affords the fairest hope of contentment, at least in the Upper Province, which the Duke declares to be the key of our position in North America.

Ld. Stanley and I have been treated so kindly and confidentially both by the Duke and Peel, that it is in a peculiar degree painful to us to be driven to take a decisive part, where these two leaders differ. Our constant and cordial desire is, and ever has been, to promote the union and to consult the feelings of the great Party which admitted us so generously into its ranks: and tho' we may have erred in judgment, we never took a step designedly inconsistent with the respect and deference due to the leaders, whom we found at the head of the party which we joined. On the contrary you will bear witness that we have endeavoured to smoothe and remove difficulties, and to the last you may rely on our adherence to this course: and no passing event of the day can change my fixed admiration of the character of the Duke or diminish my sense of his greatness or my gratitude for his kindness.

There is some mistake in what you have heard with regard to Ld. Liveden [*sic*] conversation with me. His view was *the opposite* to that which has been stated to you. He was of opinion, that if the Government resigned on the rejection of the Canada Bill, Peel would not be justified in refusing to form an Administration. No sane man could contemplate a Conservative Government without the Duke. I have always thought that some risk might be prudently run in precipitating a change, lest we might lose the tower of strength, which his name is considered throughout the world. . . .

### 219. The Earl of Aberdeen to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Argyll House, 14 July 1840.*— . . . I hope your apprehensions respecting the consequences of the Canada affair are much exaggerated. I mean at home, for I do not pretend to say what may be the result of the Government measure in the provinces. It has doubtless been a most unfortunate difference; and one which I sincerely believe has arisen from accident, but which, from the want of personal communication between the Duke and Peel, may recur at any time. I trust, however, that the feelings of the party, which have been a good deal excited during this business, will now subside, and that matters will return to their usual course.

I think the Duke has behaved with the utmost magnanimity in the whole affair. Whether his opinion may be correct, in predicting the consequences of the measure, is quite another question, upon which I do not feel competent to decide; but entertaining that opinion as he did, he could not act otherwise. I have said his conduct was magnanimous, and in fact he made a great personal sacrifice for the sake of the party. When it became clear, from their written

declarations, that neither Peel nor Stanley would incur any responsibility, in the event of the Government being overthrown, as it would inevitably have been, by the rejection of the Bill, the Duke shaped his own course accordingly. He had a meeting of peers at Apsley House on the morning of Lord Hardwicke's motion; and of all the admirable statements I have heard him make at these meetings, I was never so much struck as on this occasion. The effect of his address was like magick; and although we had many present who were obstinate, violent and wrong-headed, not a syllable was said in opposition to the Duke's suggestion. He treated the whole subject with the utmost dexterity and skill; and when he spoke of his own position, it was beautifully done, and the effect was irresistible. I am happy to think that he was pleased with the conduct of the peers. Indeed, I have never known such an instance of his power and influence. Under the very peculiar circumstances in which this question was placed, that he should only have found ten persons refractory is most wonderful.

I was present at a meeting of the Duke and Peel at dinner, at M. Guizot's<sup>1</sup> after this debate, and I observed that the Duke was determined to shew the most marked cordiality in his manner. So much so, that it must have put an end to any speculation of coolness or personal estrangement.

## 220. Sir Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Drayton Manor, 11 October* [1840].— . . . I think it probable that the War Party and the Peace Party in France expect each results [*sic*] in support of their respective views—from the early convocation of the Chambers. If Louis Philippe is very much pressed by Thiers, the assembling of the Chambers may be his only chance of maintaining peace—at any rate it enables him to divide with other public authorities the responsibility of a decision—whether that decision be for peace or war. There must be a powerful peace party in France—a silent and inactive one as compared with its opponent—but the extension of commercial enterprize and the making of money by honest industry must have produced many sober, rational men who have sense and foresight enough to compare the risks of war to a prosperous country like France, with any probable gain.

I am not at all sorry for the manifestations of a revolutionary spirit at the theatres. They will inculcate salutary alarm, and if Louis Philippe will hold firmly to a pacific policy, will strengthen instead of weakening him. He appears to me to have acted a most foolish part hitherto in exciting, at least not discouraging, the clamour for war—hoping that he can get his forts and then appease the clamour.

*Ibid.*, *Drayton Manor, 15 October* [1840].— . . . This appeal beforehand to public opinion respecting pending negotiations—by the publication of official papers—is a novel and in my opinion will prove an embarrassing course. Thiers of course will justify the publication of his reply—by the previous one of Lord Palmerston's note. Both one and the other are an attempt to set the

<sup>1</sup> He was now French ambassador in London.

parties right in the opinion of the world—but the objection to this is that you purchase some temporary advantage at the risk of throwing fresh obstacles in the way of an amicable conclusion.

If Thiers should succeed in mitigating the unfavorable opinion of this country as to the course which France has pursued—he will in pretty nearly the same degree add strength to the war-party in France. If he is chargeable with mis-statements or fallacies—there must be a rejoinder for the purpose of correcting or exposing them. The public is thus invited to take the duty of Governments in deciding whether there shall be peace or war—and they will decide upon documents which read very plausibly—but in which probably all the important facts and the real motives of the parties are studiously concealed. . . .

### 221. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Netherby, 19 October 1840 —Private*—I leave this place today for Glasgow to be present at the election of the Divinity Professor, but I hope to return before the end of the week and I shall remain here till the meeting of Parliament. My own impression is that we shall have a session before Christmas; and the evil spirit which possesses France, must end in war or in a dangerous revolution. Louis Philippe has a charmed existence; but some day or other the crime will be successful: and the commencement of a new reign will be the signal for a struggle.<sup>1</sup>

Peel did not show me what he wrote to you on Sunday: he only mentioned the fact that he had written. I told him that Ministers reckoned on his support and on the Duke's: and that this expectation rested on assurances given by Ld. Burghersh both to Ld. and to Lady Palmerston. This was stated to me in London on authority which I considered good: and I reported it to Peel, that he might guard against false surmises, which would create wrong impressions in the minds of foreign Ministers and of the party generally: and if the Press took its tone from these supposed declarations, an effect would be produced on the public mind, which it might not be possible to obviate. I never dreamt of any authority being given by the Duke for these assertions, and I did not so represent it to Peel: but I feared the consequences of Ld. Burghersh's language to Palmerston, unless counteracted or disavowed.

I am sorry that the communication to Peel should have produced any confusion, but he appeared to pay little attention to it at the moment, and we did not dwell upon the subject.

The meeting of the French Chambers and the next account from the coast of Syria will throw great light on our future prospects: until then speculation must be vague.

*Ibid., Netherby, 8 November 1840. Private.*—I cannot delay thanking you very cordially for your great kindness in sending me copies of the Duke's letter to you and of your letter to Peel. I am really sorry to have given you so

<sup>1</sup> An attempt was made to assassinate him on the 15th (*Ann. reg.*, 1840, *Chronicle*, p. 90).

much trouble ; but you could have taken it for no one who feels a warmer or more deep anxiety for the attainment of the object, which you have in view, and which you have done so much to accomplish. The Duke's letter is a frank invitation to more frequent confidential intercourse ; and I shall be grieved if Peel do not improve the opportunity thus given. I understand that Peel is now in London, and will remain there for a week. Is there any chance of the Duke passing thro' to Strathfieldsaye ? An early friendly meeting between them would be most satisfactory. I happened to be writing to Ld. Lyndhurst a day or two ago, and I entreated him to call on Peel, who, I hear with pleasure, has acted kindly with regard to the Cambridge election.

Stanley in writing to me about a week since uses these expressions ; ' I am glad that to a certain extent you confirm what I had heard from Wilton, that the Duke and Peel are on more confidential terms. I cannot, however, help fearing that they never will be upon that footing on which in their relative positions they ought to be, of constant, almost daily, unreserved communication as to the topics to be dealt with in the two Houses.' The nearer we can approach to this the better, and thanks to you, a great advance has been made. The peace of Europe depends on the events of the next fortnight in Paris. If the Soult-Guizot Administration can maintain its ground, the *present* danger is postponed ; if it be overthrown, chaos bursts upon us in a moment.

Ld. Francis Egerton was quite right in the opinion which he had formed of the feelings of the population of Syria under the grinding oppression of Mehemet Ali's government. The operations on the coast have been prompt, bold and decisive.<sup>1</sup>

*Ibid.*, Netherby, 15 November 1840.— . . . Our affairs in Central Asia wear an ugly aspect. I have always thought ill of that expedition,<sup>2</sup> from the immediate dangers of which we escaped by a miracle : but the Duke, I remember, said, that our real difficulties would commence with our first success ; and that the permanent occupation of Caubul would be necessary, but attended with danger and ruinous expense at such a distance from our resources and natural frontier.

We may patch up our quarrel with France, but they will look out for some better opportunity of attack ; and until we have smashed their rising navy we shall have no solid peace. Every generation of revolutionary Frenchmen requires a licking to prove to them that they are not invincible. . . .

## 222. The Duke of Wellington to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Walmer Castle*, 16 November 1840.— . . . Nothing can be more satisfactory to me than Sir Robert Peel's letter. I have always found him as he describes himself, most ready to communicate with me. The truth is that he in the H. of Commons and I in the H. of Lords cannot originate a communication, either

<sup>1</sup> France's support of Mehemet Ali against the sultan almost caused war to break out with England. An English naval force co-operating with the Turkish army expelled Mehemet Ali from Syria.

<sup>2</sup> Which placed Shah Shuja on the Afghan throne in 1839.

with the other, upon the particular business of the House, in which each takes a part; and there can be no natural communication till the business of the two requires communication or is likely to clash. Now I have the misfortune of being deaf; particularly in a meeting such as is held for consultation on the mode of proceeding in Parlt., in which meeting it is not unusual for many to talk at the same time. I don't doubt but that Sir Robt. Peel and those who act with him would be glad to see me at all such meetings. But I should be useless to them. My attendance would be an useless waste of my time. All this naturally separates me from Sir Robt. and his councils, and I don't meet him excepting by accident or when the cause of the publick renders our communication necessary. But I must say that I have always been ready to talk to him, as he to me: and as I told you in a former letter I generally, indeed always, find that without any previous communication he and I are found upon the same ground.

Publick affairs are in a very critical state. I don't see how the Govt. can extricate themselves from their difficulties, nor do I think that we could improve the matter much if these Ministers were beat and run, and leave the Administration in our hands. The truth is we require to be governed. We want an Administration which will not seek popularity excepting in the strict performance of its whole duty as Government. But that is what the country will not have, and will not support. We must do the best we can, therefore, and prevent as much mischief as possible, whether by the existing Ministry or our own adherents or the Radicals, and at all events delay it.

### 223. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Netherby, 1 January 1841.*—... Our affairs in the East have been strangely imbrangled by the follies of Ld. Ponsonby and Napier; and Palmerston deserves all the difficulties of his present position for allowing these two men to remain at posts of great danger, when neither of them can be trusted. Napier has the courage of a lion and should be held in a leash, ready to slip, when war is declared; but a more dangerous man was never employed when obedience to orders, moderation and good conduct are required. Ld. Ponsonby's demerits are notorious, and not denied or defended by the Government.<sup>1</sup>

I am afraid it will be difficult, if not impossible, to preserve peace with France: and all the advantages of the Eastern Settlement, be they what they may, will cost us dear, if we obtain them at the price of a general war: yet this will be the result of Palmerston's foreign policy. We can have no peace while France is excluded from general European arrangements; and whether she or we are to blame, the result is war, unless this exclusion cease. I expect

<sup>1</sup> In November 1840 Admiral Napier, who was blockading Syria, signed a convention with Mehemet Ali's representative, by which the Pasha was to retain Egypt subject to his restoring the Turkish fleet and evacuating Syria. He acted without authorisation, though Lord Ponsonby, our ambassador at Constantinople, had given him to understand that such terms would be acceptable to the British government.

Molé to supplant Guizot ; and if he do, I doubt the stability of our new Russian alliance.

I am glad that the Duke will be in town before the meeting of Parliament. He will find Stanley there. He went on Monday for the approaching confinement of his wife. Stanley told me with satisfaction that he had heard from the Duke on foreign affairs. I hear occasionally from Peel, but he gives no indication of an opinion as to the course to be taken on the Address ; and I am sure it is far wiser that no fixed resolution should be formed until he confer with the Duke and Stanley, and until all the materials for a prudent decision are collected and brought before them. I do not see how the conduct of the Government with respect to Repeal in Ireland can long remain unnoticed : and this subject is intimately connected with the reduced amount of our military force, and with the criminal neglect of its augmentation. Since the rebellion in Ireland, our army there was never so weak and agitation never so formidable, yet the enemies of British connection, *who look to war for aid*, are the friends and main supporters of the Queen's Ministers ; and these guardians of the united Empire fulfil their trust by leaving the point of attack naked and defenceless, in return for votes in the H. of Commons!! These things cannot be overlooked and ought to be brought prominently before the British nation. The mode and time should be well considered, but the thing must be done, and done speedily.

Your extract from Melville's letter is very interesting, and contains a most sound and rational view of our Indian and China affairs. That Affghan expedition will in its results be found most dangerous ; and its temporary success has never shaken my opinion on this point. As to China, you know my sentiments ; and the capture of Chusan will not help us in the least to an early settlement.

I now intend to stay here till the 18th : indeed I fear that I shall be unable to move sooner, and I hope to be in London on the evening of the 19th. I hope you will come up to Apsley House and that we may meet on my arrival. Your presence is always useful and to me more especially agreeable. . . . *Entre nous* Stanley and I intend to join the Carlton : at this juncture our accession may be useful as a proof of cordiality and perfect union.

*Ibid*, *Netherby*, 15 January 1841.— . . . Your account of the Cabinet feud is curious and I have no doubt accurate. Clarendon and Ld. Palmerston are rivals, and the former by no means scrupulous in the means which he uses to win success. A strong Cabinet cannot stand long, when protests are allowed : it will be a miracle if this rickety patchwork be held together over another session by Royal favor in defiance of the Lords, with a majority dwindling to nothing in the Commons.

*Ibid.*, *H. of Commons*, 23 February 1841. *Private*.—I could not write to you last night, as I was fully occupied in assisting Stanley in the use of his numerous documents. He spoke for 3 hours<sup>1</sup> and executed his purpose well. I am afraid that no speech can now influence a vote ; if it were possible, he

<sup>1</sup> On the Registration of Voters (Ireland) Bill. The division took place on the 25th, and the second reading was carried by 299 to 294.



might have persuaded many : he shook some ; but they all natural[ly] return true to the attraction of the Treasury Bench. Sir Gilbert Heathcote and his son both appeared, and will vote against us.<sup>1</sup> All their sick, halt and blind with hardly an exception have been brought to the post. Lowther has not yet appeared, and I cannot now put their majority below 10. This intelligence will disgust you ; but I have never been so sanguine as to expect a majority ; and I could never see my way beyond the probability of 6 against us. The debate will be protracted certainly till tomorrow, perhaps till Thursday. All the Irishmen on both sides will speak ; and when they once begin, you know how they run on. . . .

*Ibid.*, Grosvenor Place, 27 February 1841.—Our division was better by two or three than I had ventured to hope. When it came to the point they did not dare to produce Ld. Douglas Halliburton, who is in a state of fatuity ; Mr. Swynfen Jervis walked away without a pair, and Walter Campbell refused to come up from Scotland. Sir Gilbert Heathcote appeared to be ashamed of what he was doing : and I trust that your friends in Lincolnshire will punish Gibby for this decisive act of wayward Radicalism.

We are curious to know what course the Government will take on Monday, and our move must depend on their decision. They will, I think, endeavour to postpone the further progress of their Bill really till after Easter, nominally to a distant day ; if so, we can only quicken them by the threat of Stanley's Bill : yet the risk of losing it prematurely for the session on the 2nd reading is a serious evil. One thing we must specially avoid, and that is the amendment of the Government measure, for we shall then become responsible for a new Irish Reform Bill based on a dangerous principle, however specious may be the apparent alterations of its details, and it would be most unwise to send up such a measure to the H. of Lords favored in the least degree with our partial sanction. Yet some of our ' candid ' friends, the Lascelles and the Elliots, will not be unwilling to play this game, which constitutes the sole lingering hope of the Government. . . .

*Ibid.*, H. of Commons, 12 March 1841. *Private*.—I have been confined to my room since Saturday by a sharp attack of influenza : and we have been under some anxiety from the fear that the Duke would think it necessary, from a sense of public duty, to support the motion of the Bishop of Exeter for the rejection of the Canadian Ordinance incorporating the Roman Catholic College at Montreal.<sup>2</sup> The worst consequences would have ensued from such a vote in the H. of Lords ; and if the Duke had decided to support it, the majority was certain. I am happy, however, to say that on a full review of all that has passed on this subject in former Administrations, the Duke has come to the decision that the Ordinance must take its course and that the Bishop's motion cannot be supported. I rejoice sincerely at this determination, which is an additional proof, if proof were wanting, of the candor of his mind, which is open at all times to reason and to argument, and holds out the strongest

<sup>1</sup> They did so.

<sup>2</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, lvii 194 (15 March). The duke spoke in opposition to the motion, which was rejected

inducement to *free, early, and constant* communication with him. All is now quite right again, and we stand, therefore, quite as well as when you left London. While matters were in painful suspense I did not write to you, but I hasten now to communicate to you the termination of what has been a most anxious period. If the Bishop had carried his motion, the Ministers would have resigned and our scrape would have been very serious: however, all is well that ends well.

I am told that the arrangement is all but concluded between France and the Four Powers, and that France may now be expected to disarm. If so, the courage of the Yankee will soon cool.<sup>1</sup> Ld. Ponsonby is a firebrand at Constantinople and is playing the devil there.

*Ibid.*, [Grosvenor Place, 24 March 1841]. *Most Confidential*.—According to your desire I commit to a separate sheet of paper my observations in answer to that part of your two last letters, which I consider secret and most important.

I had considered your first letter most anxiously, and had come to the resolution not to communicate its contents even to Stanley, because it opened the door to an arrangement, which I think undesirable; and because it specified conditions so precise and of such magnitude as might excite both prejudice and alarm. In the present state of foreign affairs the constant presence of the Duke in a Conservative Cabinet is indispensable; and while he lives, no other man can quiet the House of Lords. An open rebellion in Ireland would justify his temporary absence from the seat of Government, but nothing *less* than this should deprive the Executive Government of the constant, steady, and clear light of his vast experience, superior judgment, and magic influence throughout the world. Moreover, the conditions on which he would insist before he went to Ireland, are conditions founded on a large view of general policy; if rejected, the Government could not be formed; if settled, the Duke could no more object to sit in the Cabinet than to serve as Ld. Lt.—and I repeat, that his presence or absence constitutes in my judgment the essence of the stability or of the incurable weakness & short life of a Conservative Administration.

I had resolved, therefore, not to communicate your first letter to *any one*, when I received your second this morning: and it has confirmed me in the prudence of my first decision. It is clear that the Duke agrees with me and is of opinion that he ought not to go to Ireland *except in the last extremity*; and some other expressions which you mention, lead me to hope that he might be induced to throw his shield over Peel's Government and to take his share of direct responsibility in Downing Street.

In these circumstances I am sure it is wiser not to open to anyone the view of Ireland. All will yet be right, if Peel and he can be brought together again. I wrote to Ld. Aberdeen yesterday on the Scotch Church question, and I took occasion to mention to him the great anxiety which both Stanley and I feel on this point: in writing also to Ld. Francis Egerton I touched on this same subject, and I do hope that the efforts of common friends may be successful. I think you might write to Peel from Walmer with good effect. He asked me

<sup>1</sup> Americans had unofficially supported the Canadian rebellion of 1837, and the McLeod trial in 1840 stirred up more anti-British feeling in the United States.

just before I left London, whether I had heard from you : I gave him a vague answer, because I could not show him your letter ; but it appeared to me that he still looked to you as the channel of friendly communication with the Duke. You are so judicious and know Peel so well, that your letter could do no harm ; and it might lead to the renewal of that intercourse, which we all so fervently desire.

*Ibid.*, Grosvenor Place, 8 May 1841.—I consider the fate of the Government decided last night.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Lushington on behalf of the Anti-Slavery Party declared against them ; and Mr. Handley, the member for Lincolnshire, in the name of a portion of the Whig County members, announced his opposition in no measured terms. They will be beaten by a considerable majority, and it will be more than poetical justice that they should die by the hand of Dr. Lushington, and be smothered in sugar by an Anti-Slavery agitation. I think they cannot dissolve · their clap-trap has proved a bubble, which has burst as soon as blown ; and they now stand on unpopular ground. I never saw any political manœuvre so successful as the course which we have adopted on this occasion : it seems like the rent and disaster, which in the long run never fail to attend dishonest courses. . . .

#### 224. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Woodford*, 9 June 1841.— . . . I am also very sorry that Ld. Duncannon feels sure of *their* having a majority. He is [a] great authority, for except the last general election he has always been right. At the last election he said that they shd. gain 30, & they lost 15 ; making a difference of 45 seats, equal to 90 votes. . . .

*Ibid.*, Apsley House, 21 June 1841.—I can only write a line as my time is taken up with seeing people on elections &c. . . .

Our prospects improve daily. I don't like to boast, but I do believe we shall do famously. . . .

*Ibid.*, Apsley House, 28 June 1841.— . . . We are very sanguine about the City of London, but there is no knowing what the result may be. I hope that we have not been too sanguine about the elections generally. There will be no contest I am pretty [certain] in Northamptonshire. . . .

*Ibid.*, Walmer Castle, 6 July 1841.— . . . My letters from London today, & the Duke's also, give excellent accounts of our prospects. We shall have, I have every reason to hope & believe, a very considerable majority in the new Pt. We have gained 8 I hear in the English boroughs, in which Lord Duncannon felt sure that *they* shd. gain *fifteen*. They told the Queen that they were sure of *fifty* in the new Parliament & I learn from excellent authority that *they* are greatly cast down by the present result. . . .

*Ibid.*, Walmer Castle, 7 July 1841.— . . . I hear from good authority that

<sup>1</sup> The debate on the sugar duties lasted from the 7th to the 18th, when the government was defeated by 317 to 281. The proposal was to give a preference to foreign slave-grown sugar over West Indian sugar grown by free labour. On 4 June the opposition carried a vote of censure by 312 to 311, and the Government dissolved parliament.

the Ministers are quite *crestfallen*. Ld. Duncannon had assured the Queen that in the new Pt. they shd. gain a clear majority of 50, & just before the elections he had also declared that in the English boroughs they should gain 15. In those boroughs, now ended, their loss is 8. The most moderate calculation now is that we shall have a majority of about 60; & the sanguine ones say that it will approach to 100, which is too good for me to believe. That the Whig Govt. is gone is now a certainty, & Heaven be praised for it. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Walmer Castle*, 13 July 1841.— . . . The elections are going on beautifully. The defeats of O'Connell, of Lord Morpeth, & of Ld. Howick are excellent. We have driven out many of their chief people. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Walmer Castle*, 15 July 1841.— . . . The elections go on successfully. I think we can't have less than 70 majority; but the Irish seats may turn the scale against us. I am glad to see that we have got Cornwall. I am very anxious about S. Cheshire. . . .

*Ibid.*, *Walmer Castle*, 18 July 1841.— . . . Our success has been so great that go they must; & stay out they must. I am sure that they never contemplated such a triumph as our's has been. Perhaps you may find out how the Queen takes it.<sup>1</sup> We shall have so good a majority that *rats* may come over to us afterwards. . . .

## 225. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Cowes*, 30 July 1841.—I have been wandering about at elections ever since we parted in London; and I only arrived here on Saturday last after a second visit to my constituents at Dorchester for the purpose of giving an election dinner. Altho' we have sustained some unexpected defeats, yet we have won some signal victories: and my original estimate of a gain of 35 seats has been more than realized. I believe that our sure majority is 78; and if we stand well on our legs after the first round, some stragglers will come in and swell our ranks. I saw Peel in London about ten days ago. He was in excellent spirits and appeared to me quite equal to the occasion. He has resolved, as I think most wisely, and I understand with the full approbation of the Duke, not to oppose the re-election of Mr. Lefevre to the Chair. I infer from Ld. J. Russell's address to his constituents, that the Ministers intend to insert in the Speech from the Throne a direct commendation of their policy. I hope that they will commit this crowning folly, for it will give us every facility; and we shall not only be justified but compelled to move an amendment in both Houses: and for Party purposes it will be most useful that we should begin where we left off, and explicitly declare our want of confidence in H.M.'s advisers.

Peel told me that he was writing to the Duke on the very day when I visited him; and I rejoice therefore in the certainty of their uninterrupted confidential intercourse. With this ample time for preparation, the new Government ought to be formed quickly, when the change takes place. I know not what to augur of the disposition of the Queen. I am told here by some who have the means

<sup>1</sup> Lieutenant-Colonel Arbuthnot was appointed an equerry to the queen in September.

of knowing, that she has become comparatively indifferent to public affairs, and that Ld. Melbourne is the only link which binds her to the present Ministry : yet these visits to Woburn and to Pansanger would seem to tell another tale : and surely they are injudicious and ill-timed : for they not only parade her before the public as an active partizan, but they present her in the degrading character of the head of a beaten faction. It is not generous in those who surround her there to use their influence. . . .

Since the Dissolution has proved a failure, I am assured that some of the Cabinet Ministers are anxious now to declare that the step was taken against their wish, and in opposition to their recorded opinion. I have no doubt that John Russell was the evil counsellor ; but somehow or other he never fails to recommend the most dangerous and violent measures, and his colleagues always end by adopting them, tho' they are shabby enough partly to disclaim him.

I hope the Duke continues well. His visit to Woburn at this juncture is remarkable. The Duke of Bedford<sup>1</sup> seems anxious in appearance to moderate the part taken by his brother : yet in reality the concord between them is perfect and sincere. . . .<sup>2</sup>

#### 226. Sir Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Whitehall, Wednesday [c. August 1841].*— . . . I shall do nothing whatever with respect to the Ordinance or Lord Londonderry without further conversation with the Duke. I care not a straw about him or his opposition, if we have justice on our side, but considering what took place about St. Petersburg,<sup>3</sup> and the injustice with which he was treated by the House of Commons, and the manner in which he behaved on that occasion, relieving us from any difficulty by voluntary retirement, I have a conscientious impression that he is entitled to some fair offer.

Stanley was one of those who contributed to his removal from Petersburg. Will he not have *just* ground to complain if nothing be now done for him ? He will only be strong by having *just* complaint.

I am very much gratified by Lord F. Egerton's letter, which I will detain a little. I have the highest opinion of him, and a most sincere personal regard and esteem for him. He would have filled the office of Chancellor of the Duchy with great éclat.

*Ibid., Drayton Manor, 4 August [1841].*— . . . The Duke will no doubt have shown you a letter which I wrote to him on Sunday on the subject of the Chair. With four or five exceptions every one of those who have taken an active part in debate or public business was in favour of the re-election of the late Speaker. Lowther, the Duke of Buckingham, Sir John Tyrrell, Mr. Neeld,

<sup>1</sup> Lord Tavistock had succeeded his father as seventh Duke

<sup>2</sup> The Melbourne ministry was defeated in the new parliament by 360 to 269 on 27 August, and Peel was called upon to form a government.

<sup>3</sup> See No. 203D, and Parker's *Peel*, ii. 483-4. He refused to return to the Vienna embassy, and was left out of the ministry.

Disraeli, and I suppose most of the Ultras, are in favour of opposing Lefevre. Sugden, Burdett, and Serjeant Jackson spoke doubtfully. Every other person of note—Lord G. Somerset, Goulburn, Stanley, Graham, Eliot, Sandon, Follett, Pemberton, Knatchbull, Inglis, Ashley (Mahon, I think), and a host of the most respectable County members, Acland, Liddell, Lord Darlington, Darby, Plumptre &c. were strongly against opposition to Lefevre. They are pleased with the selection of a country gentleman to the Chair. They think it a compliment to the class, and that the manner in which Lefevre has executed the duties of the office confers a distinction upon it.

However, acquiescence in the re-election of Lefevre will confirm the arguments in favour of a strong amendment to the Address. This will be in my opinion absolutely necessary. I hope the Duke will have concurred in the view I have taken in favour of the re-election of Shaw Lefevre.

Pray write to me as often as you can.

#### 227. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Cowes, 6 August, 1841, Confidential.*— . . . Our acquiescence in the re-election of Lefevre, which I think right and judicious, renders an amendment to the Address indispensable and almost inevitable. If we do not lead, it will be done, and I am disposed to think that the step is necessary. The Ministers will try to lead us into a discussion of their measures with the view of hampering us in the free selection of our own: in such circumstances, is it not more prudent to deal with the *men* rather than with their *measures*; and to declare to the Crown that we have no confidence in her present advisers? An Address from both Houses to this effect must be conclusive; if it be not, some other course than a Corn Law debate will be forced upon us.

I am anxious that you should be in London, when the change takes place; it is so agreeable to communicate with you; and you possess in so eminent a degree the confidence and good will of so many important parties.

*Ibid., Cowes, 10 August 1841.*— . . . The advice of the Duke with respect to the Household is most wise and judicious; and I am persuaded that Peel will be disposed to follow it implicitly.

Sir Henry Parnell is here, and there is a report that he is to be made a *peer for life*!! with several others, and that he will be placed at the head of the Poor Law Commission in Ireland on the resignation of Nicholl[s]. These Poor Law appointments are *during pleasure* by Act of Parliament, and I think we should know how to deal with any such nomination in present circumstances. This matter of the grant of peerages for life is far more serious: and if attempted would really constitute a high crime and misdemeanour on the part of a Minister, who in despair on his retirement gave such wicked advice. I hope the rumor may prove unfounded; but it comes from a near relation of Parnell's. . . .

*Ibid., Grosvenor Place, 4 September 1841. Private.*—I have sent to Bingham Baring, and I have requested him to call on me tomorrow after Church. I think it is most likely that he will accept; but I have spoken to Sir R. Peel, and in the event of Mr. Baring's refusal, he wishes me to have a member of the

H. of Commons at the Home Office, and suggests the name of Mr. Manners Sutton, the son of Lord Canterbury, who cannot safely vacate the seat for Cambridge, but to whom some provision is due.<sup>1</sup>

The merits of Lord Dalhousie are very great ; and I am honored by his willingness to forego the just claims of his rank and station, and to serve in a department where I preside : but he has taken a very prominent and decided part on the Scotch Church question, and his appointment to the Home Office would be regarded in Scotland as an overt act of hostility to a powerful party in the church whom it is vain to attempt to conciliate, but whom it is unwise to provoke and to exasperate by any offence which can be avoided.<sup>2</sup>

*Ibid.*, *Whitehall*, 4 September 1841. *Private*.—Lord Ashburton has not yet sent an answer ; and my appointment of an Under-Secretary remains suspended until we receive it. I will speak to Peel on the subject of your suggestion, when I meet him at the Cabinet, where I am now going.

## 228. Sir Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Whitehall*, 29 September 1841. *Private*.—I do not think it would be advisable that a vacancy should take place under present circumstances in the southern division of Lancashire.<sup>3</sup> However certain success might be, yet considering the position of the Government, and the pressure of commercial embarrassment and distress in these particular districts and branches of trade—which the Southern division of Lancashire includes, a vacancy created at this time by any act to which the Government was directly a party, seems to me greatly to be deprecated. It *might* involve a serious responsibility.

On Monday last Sir James Graham brought to me a letter from Sir Charles Shaw, who is at the head of the police at Manchester. It stated that preparations on a great scale were then making for an immense meeting at Manchester for the following day for the reception of Fergus O'Connor. It described a very extensive system of confederacy, extending through all the populous districts in the neighbourhood of Manchester—spoke of the possibility that on the very next day there might be a congregation of 100,000 persons poured into Manchester—anticipated a probably [*sic*] conflict between the Chartists and the Irish—said that each party was arming for it—that the troops would be ordered to their barracks—to be ready for decisive and combined support to the civil power—and that in the meantime he had only 200 policemen for the maintenance of the public peace.

Now with this account in our possession of the state of the principal district of South Lancashire—with the attempts making by the Anti-Corn Law League

<sup>1</sup> J. H. T. Manners-Sutton, afterwards third Viscount Canterbury, became under-secretary of state for home affairs, and Bingham Baring, Lord Ashburton's son, secretary to the board of control.

<sup>2</sup> It was not until 1843 that Dalhousie joined the government as vice-president of the board of trade.

<sup>3</sup> Presumably by the elevation of Lord Francis Egerton to a peerage. The vacancy thus created was delayed until 1846. He had told Peel that he did not wish for office (*Greville memoirs*, 1 September 1846).

to excite and influence the people—should any of us, the Government, Lord Francis Egerton, the Duke of Wellington, be justified in affording to that League such an opportunity for excitement and inflammation as an election for South Lancashire would inevitably afford.

Parliament will separate in a few days, and our great object has been to keep out of view all topics calculated to disturb the public mind, or give to agitators the means of agitation. Depend upon it, an election for South Lancashire just now would amply supply those means.

No Parliamentary duties will be required from Lord Francis for some months to come—and if they had been—I am sure every one, his constituents included, would have willingly acquiesced in his absence from the House of Commons.

*Ibid.*, [? September 1841].—I reserve for a separate page one consideration. With the apathy of the Conservative party in South Lancashire, and considering the expences to which future elections *may* expose a candidate, but not only this—but the certain *annual* charge of providing for registration &c.—would it be quite fair towards the Duke of Wellington to involve him in this? It might be a very *serious affair*—if the Conservative party is so unwilling to expend money for absolutely necessary purposes.

## 229. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Whitehall, 15 October 1841. Private.*— . . . Bulwer does not go to Canada. He would, I think, have done well there: for at Paris<sup>1</sup> he has proved himself adroit and by no means violent: and I think he would have managed with success the French Canadians. The transfer from Paris to Quebec would have been flattering to their pride, and I was favorable to the arrangement. Bulwer however was unwilling to go, and the matter is entirely at an end.

Some of your comments may be well-founded. In making these extensive arrangements none are more conscious of the imperfection of the work than those who are responsible, yet they must use such materials as they can command, and, as in a picture, parts will be defective; but you must look at the *whole*, and judge by the general effect. Tried by this just principle our panorama will bear inspection.

What say you to Ellenborough? I feel confident that he will do well: the advantage is great of sending a Governor General<sup>2</sup> direct from the Cabinet. I hope and believe that this appointment is approved by the Duke.

We have every reason to be satisfied with Windsor. As yet we have not been thwarted in one single matter of importance, and I can discover no indisposition to give us fair play. We shall never be favorites, but if we are allowed to continue Ministers in full enjoyment of power, we have no reason to complain. If we keep our own party together, we shall weather the storm; if jealousies and divisions prevail, our overthrow is certain.

<sup>1</sup> As secretary of embassy, 1839–43, and minister plenipotentiary *ad int.*, 1839, 1840 and 1841

<sup>2</sup> Of India.



I am afraid that the distress in the manufacturing districts is severe : the masters exaggerate it to raise the Anti-Corn Law cry and to cover the reduction of wages produced by machinery.

### 230. Sir Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Whitehall, 28 October 1841.*—I think the possible loss of a seat for Lancashire is a consideration subordinate to that of voluntarily involving the southern division of that county in the excitement inseparable from an election at the present time. At a general election the thing is unavoidable—it is a matter of course—the excitement is generally diffused, and attention is not concentrated upon one vacancy in particular. A challenge given to the constituency of South Lancashire at this moment—involving as it must every inflammable appeal to disappointment, distress, want of employment &c., would in my opinion be a hazardous and hardly justifiable proceeding.

I wish most heartily I had the power of providing for Captain Greville. But I do assure you that two hours of every day almost, are occupied by me in answering applications *for civil employment* for those who either have no profession, or who seek civil office instead of professional employment. So far as I can judge I have nothing to dispose of—excepting Household office, parliamentary office—and chance seats occasionally falling vacant at a Board of Revenue. Every other appointment within the range of my patronage either requires previous service in subordinate situations, as in the Revenue ; or professional knowledge and habits if it be connected with the Law. ‘ *Some civil employment* ’ is what everybody asks for—but the patronage of the Executive Government is in truth *professional* patronage.

I could hardly make Lord Wellesley believe that on a change of Government, involving so many changes in political office—I had not the means of providing an employment for his secretary, Mr. Alfred Montgomery—a candidate for civil office—not being connected with the Household or House of Commons. But I have not had *one* of this description—nor the prospect of one.

With respect to Sir John Gerard, I gave him exactly the same answer which I have given to others (including many of our best and steadiest friends) who have addressed me on the subject of the Peerage. In the present condition of the House of Lords—and the effect which profuse additions to the number have had and must have on the constitutional character and influence of the House of Lords—I have felt it a matter of duty to decline absolutely entering into any engagements or giving civil assurances, partaking if they mean anything—of the nature of engagements, on the subject of the peerage. I have not even opened my lips to the Queen upon it.

People suppose that in the event of the birth of a Prince of Wales, there must be a new creation of peers and baronets. I know not whence this impression originates—there were no new creations in 1762 on the birth of George the Fourth.

## 231. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Whitehall, 13 December 1841. Private* — . . . I must, however, remind you, that when I wrote my last letter, I told you that I had not spoken to Peel on the subject, and consequently I had no authority whatever to make any offer. I wished to obtain some confidential information, or rather an opinion, from you, which might guide my course : and I am rather sorry that you sent my letter to Ld. Dalhousie, which I did not intend to be communicated to him. I hope however, that no bad consequences will ensue. H.M. would be mortally offended if it should transpire that Household appointments were made matters of discussion and arrangement, not only without her consent, but without her knowledge. What has passed between us must therefore in present circumstances go no further.

## 232. Lord Cowley to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Paris, 23 October 1842. Private*.— . . . The enmity of the Press towards England is, as you say, becoming quite ludicrous, but it does not at all interfere with our personal comfort. It is, however, attended with this great inconvenience, that it exercises a powerful influence over the conduct of the Government. The question of the right of search<sup>1</sup> is the great cheval de bataille of the Opposition. It is generally unpopular throughout France, partly from hatred and jealousy of England, and partly from ignorance of the real bearing of the question, for half the opposers of it imagine that the right of search is not mutual but belongs exclusively to us. I fear that Guizot will be violently attacked upon this question in the ensuing session. He is resolved, he says, to stand or fall by the Treaties of 1831 & 1833 ; as for the ratification of the Treaty of 1841, that is quite out of the question, neither Guizot nor any other Minister could venture upon such a measure. Were he to do so, he would certainly lose his place, and very likely be impeached.

I think, however, upon the whole that among public men there is a better feeling towards England than has been the case since Palmerston's Treaty of the 15 July 1840.<sup>2</sup> Nothing can exceed the general detestation in which Palmerston is held throughout the country, to that degree, that if he were to return to office I hardly think it would be possible for him to carry on any business with a French Government.

The Continental Powers are very fond of Guizot, are anxious for his continuance in power—he has in fact the merit of having restored the friendly relations which were interrupted by the folly and violence of Thiers ; and Austria and the other Powers think that the tranquillity of Europe depends very much upon his being enabled to maintain himself in power. He is not generally popular, but in high favor with the King.

<sup>1</sup> By the treaty of 20 December 1841, Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia and Russia declared the slave trade to be piracy. The powers mutually conceded to each other the right of search in the case of all ships bearing their respective flags.

<sup>2</sup> By the Treaty of London the powers agreed to compel Mehemet Ali to make peace with Turkey. If he submitted within ten days he was to retain Southern Syria ; if he held out after another ten days he was to lose not only Syria but Egypt too.

For God's sake what is Charles Bagot about! I hope he has authority from home for what he has done, but it seems a strange thing to take convicted traitors into his council! . . .<sup>1</sup>

### 233. The Earl of Dalhousie to Charles Arbuthnot.

36 *Chesham Place*, 15 December 1842.— . . . Bonham told me the other day that the Chancellor of the Exchequer<sup>2</sup> drinks nothing but soda water & milk, & Sir James Graham never tastes a drop of wine. Is that a penance inflicted by the Cabinet for the low state of the finances under the one, & the inflamed state of the manufacturing districts under the other? Pray let me into that secret.

### 234. Lord Cowley to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Paris*, 27 January [1843]. *Private*.— . . . I should have written sooner, but what with the slave trade questions, and the disputes between France and Spain about the proceedings at Barcelona,<sup>3</sup> I have had much upon my hands lately. I hope we shall get through the slave trade questions *tant bien que mal*, and without any very offensive resolution in the Chamber of Deputies. The Address has lately passed the Chamber of Peers without any mention being made of the slave trade treaties—but I fear this will not be the case in the Chamber of Deputies.<sup>4</sup>

There appear to be symptoms of a stormy session in England. What is to be done about Lord Ellenborough? Will Government support him, for I imagine his conduct will be severely attacked, and certainly nothing was ever so absurd as his Proclamations,<sup>5</sup> or so atrocious as the burnings & massacres one reads of in the Indian newspapers. It is hard upon the Government to have such proceedings to defend, if indeed they mean to defend them. . . .

Lord Brougham is here, and I am very glad he was present at the discussion in the Chamber of Peers upon the slave trade treaties. He is convinced, I believe, that the French Government could not do otherwise than decline to ratify the treaty of 1841, and equally so that Guizot is doing his utmost to maintain the other treaties. I think therefore that when this question comes to be discussed in the House of Lords, he will not give the Government any trouble. . . .

<sup>1</sup> Sir Charles Bagot, governor-general of Canada, 1842–3, brought Lafontaine, the leader of the French Canadians, into the ministry—an important step in the direction of responsible government.

<sup>2</sup> Goulburn.

<sup>3</sup> For the insurrection there in November 1842, see *Annual register*, 1842, *Hist.*, p. 300.

<sup>4</sup> See *Annual register*, 1843, *Hist.*, p. 264 sqq.

<sup>5</sup> After the successful conclusion of the Afghan War, Ellenborough, the governor-general of India, issued a Proclamation on 6 October 1842, addressing the Indian princes as 'my brothers and my friends', and congratulating them on the restoration to India of the sandal-wood gates of the temple of Somnauth which, it was believed, had been carried off to Afghanistan eight centuries before. Another proclamation on 1 October indirectly censured the policy of his predecessor, Lord Auckland.

## 235. Sir James Graham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Whitehall, 1 April, 1843. Private.*—I will not fail to communicate with Sir Robert Peel on the subject of your letter. Both he and I are actuated by the most sincere desire to consult the wishes, the ease, and comfort of the Duke of Wellington; and personally I am ready to make any sacrifice which might conduce to this object: but I am bound to say, that the business of the Home Office is so heavy, and is increasing so rapidly, that I could not undertake to continue to discharge the duties without the assistance of an Under Secretary in the House of Commons. The services of an Under Secretary are indispensable on various committees, which sit throughout the session; and for myself I can truly say that I work fourteen hours a day, that I can do no more, and that with every exertion I am scarcely able to transact the business even in a manner far from satisfactory to myself.

The arrangement therefore must be different from the one proposed: for I cannot attempt to go on without the assistance of an Under Secretary in the Commons. . . .

## 236. Sir Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Drayton Manor, August 14 [? 1845].*—I have had a very kind letter from the Duke. All that you say about the absence of communication is quite just—but where are the means during the session of Parliament? The fact is that the state of public business during a session of Parliament is becoming in many ways a matter of most serious concern. I defy the Minister of this country to perform properly the duties of his office—to read all that he ought to read, including the whole foreign correspondence, to keep up the constant communication which he must keep up with the Queen and the PRINCE—to see all whom he ought to see—to superintend the grant of honours and the disposal of civil and ecclesiastical patronage—to write with his own hand to every person of note who chooses to write to him—to be prepared for every debate including the most trumpery concerns: to do all these indispensable things—and also sit in the House of Commons eight hours a day for 118 days<sup>1</sup>

It is impossible for me not to feel that the duties are incompatible and above all human strength, at least above mine.

The worst of it is that the really important duties to the country—those out of the House of Commons, are apt to be neglected. I never mean to solve the difficulty in one way—namely, by going to the House of Lords—but it must be solved in some way or other. The failure of the mind is the usual way, as we know from sad experience. . . .<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The 1845 session lasted for 117 days.

<sup>2</sup> Arbuthnot's son Charles showed this letter to Lord John Russell in 1855, and, returning it on 13 June, Russell said: 'I should like to refer to it on Mr. Layard's motion, omitting the part about the House of Lords. But if you object, I will destroy my copy.' Russell, however, did not take part in this debate.

## 237. Lord Cowley to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Paris, 7 October 1845. Private and confidential.*— . . . A few days ago I received a private letter from Lord Aberdeen in which he says that the opinions which I have expressed in England on the prospect of our future relations with France have much increased those sentiments of uneasiness and apprehension which, for some time past, have prevailed in many quarters.

I had no conversation upon the subject with anyone but yourself, the Duke, and much more in detail with Sir James Graham. In my reply therefore to Lord Aberdeen I said, that I supposed he alluded to my conversation with Sir James Graham, and under that supposition I furnished him with the substance of that conversation of which you are already apprised, and I observed that in my judgment nothing passed in that conversation which could justify or give rise to uneasiness and apprehension in the mind of any man. That so long as the King lived we were secure of peace, but that his death would deprive us of much of that security, and that it would be but prudent to avail ourselves of the present moment for placing our coasts in a condition to repel invasion, in doing which we should only be following the example of the French, who are making strenuous efforts for the improvement of their harbours and for completing the defences of their shores. I added that perhaps the best security for the maintenance of peace was to be prepared for war, for that it might be expected that your enemy would then pause before he ventured to attack you.

Since my return to Paris I have read Thiers' fourth volume,<sup>1</sup> at least that part of it which relates to the proceedings of Bonaparte at Boulogne when he was preparing to invade us. It is well worth reading, and I think it carries with it the conviction that if Admiral Villeneuve had not disobeyed Bonaparte's orders by going to Cadiz instead of going to Brest, he (Bonaparte) would have been in a condition to undertake the invasion. Whether it would have been successful or not is another question, but supposing that the navigation by steam had then been known, what might not have been the consequence! and this is a resource which the French now possess, and of which they will no doubt avail themselves in any future contest with England. I think that this part of Thiers' book must make a deep impression upon any one who reads it, and must shew the necessity of our not losing any time in preparing ourselves for what in my belief will inevitably happen sooner or later.

I fear that the impression which our Queen has left behind her on her visit to the King of Prussia is by no means favorable. Nothing else is talked of here, and many anecdotes are told of her which it is by no means agreeable to hear. I was happy however to learn from good authority that she received Metternich with marked distinction, and that he was much flattered by her attention to him. She was all *couleur de rose* at the Chateau d'Eu, and they were all delighted with her. A Queen of England however, landing upon the coast of France in a bathing machine, is not a very dignified proceeding. . . .<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *L'Histoire du consulat et de l'empire.*

<sup>2</sup> See *Annual register, 1845, Chron.*, p. 135.

## 238. Sir Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Drayton Manor, Sunday, December 28 [1845], Secret.*—On Saturday (the 20) I wrote to the Duke that I had just heard that Lord John<sup>1</sup> had failed—that the Queen had sent to me under the impression that he was forming or had formed a Government—to take a last farewell of her—that I should meet her Majesty without a Minister—and that I was resolved if she should require my services—instead of taking leave of me—instantly to resume office.

I called the Cabinet for a late hour on Saturday night—I related what had passed with the Queen, and said that I was resolved whatever others might do to meet Parliament as the Queen's Minister. The emphatic & decisive declaration of the Duke, which will never be forgotten by me, was this. 'I was never *more delighted* than when I received Sir Robert Peel's note this morning telling me he was determined, whatever might happen, not to abandon the Queen. The question is now, not one of Corn Laws—it is one of *Government*—I will support him.' I have been hard at work to reconstruct the Govt. I have put Dalhousie in the Cabinet—Gladstone succeeds Stanley at the Colonial office—the Duke of Buccleugh will be President of the Council—Haddington, Privy Seal—Ellenborough, First Lord of the Admiralty.

I thought these arrangements in the Lords would be acceptable to the Duke, and well calculated to render him assistance. The Duke's conduct from first to last was (I can pay it no higher compliment) consistent with the past.

You speak with kindness & interest of Lord Francis Egerton. *I can satisfy you* that my feelings with regard to him were not at variance with your own. His was *the only* name I mentioned to the Queen after my resignation of office, but on reflection I feared the consequences of conferring a *single* peerage at a moment when all hope of distinctions for others must be at an end. I disliked on the other hand the thought of signalizing my retirement by anything like a lavish distribution of honours. When I resumed power I again thought of Lord Francis—with a view to office—but office of course conjoined with a seat in the House of Peers. Then it again occurred to me that his own delicacy of feeling and high sense of honour might shrink from the double & simultaneous distinction.

I concede, however, that I have the means, and I am sure I have the inclination, to avail myself of the fitting opportunity of placing Lord Francis where he ought to be, in a manner also due to his position & acceptable to his feelings. I should have told you that some time since, when Lord Francis was not dreaming of the probability of what since occurred, when he could not have had the faintest conception of it, he wrote me a letter containing decisive proof that his own observation & reasoning had led him to conclusions about the Corn Laws not very different from my own.

*Ibid., Whitehall, 7 January [1846]. Secret.*—You will be glad to hear that Lord Francis has been good enough to undertake to move the Address in the Commons. Denison, the member for the West Riding, seconds it. The members for South Lancashire and the West Riding should have great weight with

<sup>1</sup> Russell.

the rational and prudent. I am very confident as to success. I can demonstrate that everything that has been done has been for the benefit not merely of the community at large, but of the agricultural interest. Wool bears a higher price than it did before the reduction of the duty on foreign wool—so does meat—so do bullocks & cows and sheep, about which there was such absurd panic. The agricultural labourers have been better off this winter & the last than they were before—and rely upon it, that when the working classes feel convinced that their wages do not rise with the price of food—the *worst* ground on which we can fight the battle of true Conservatism is on a question of *food*.

What I am most alarmed about is our finance—not the revenue, for that is more buoyant. What a signal proof of the advantage of low prices & plenty of food, to see the excise actually increasing after the loss of the whole of the auction & the whole of the glass duties—above one million in sterling in amount. But increased estimates, naval, military and ordnance, will not only eat up our surplus but cause a considerable deficiency. Still increase there must be—but I grieve deeply at the return of *deficit*.

### 239. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Apsley House, Sunday, 2 August 1846* — . . . According to him [Sir James Graham] the Party will not be restored in its strength during our lives. He believes that Ld. Stanley will put himself in the Lords at the head of the old Tory Party, & that Ld. G. Bentinck will do the same in the Commons. But the Duke of Bedford had already told me that Sir R. Peel had the night before gone & sat between E. Ellice & Tufnell, had told them that he was going into the country, but that he had desired all his proxies in the Lords to be given for the Govt., & that he wd. give all the aid in his power! We must now wait & see what will happen a year hence at the general election; for till then nothing can be done. . . .

*Ibid., Apsley House, 1 September 1846.* — . . . Bonham was with me yesterday, & he is positive that Parliament will not be dissolved.<sup>1</sup> It is impossible to say. Bonham is pretty sure that in November <sup>2</sup> the Conservative Party will reunite, but I did not learn what reason he has for thinking so. He is positive that Ld. George Bentinck is already abandoned by most of his followers; & he is convinced, as I have said, that the Party will again reunite.

I can't think that Sir R. Peel will ever be able to collect the Party again under him, & who is to be the head of it I know not. I believe that Bonham looks to Peel himself, tho' he did not say so. This wd. never do. The Party felt that Peel had deceived them, & I cannot imagine therefore that they wd. ever have confidence in him again. Bonham spoke of Gladstone as a proper person to be the leader in the H. of Commons. It is all very doubtful. One thing is certain—our weakness & disunion alone gives strength to the Whigs. . . .

<sup>1</sup> It was dissolved in July 1847.

<sup>2</sup> When parliament was to re-assemble after the prorogation.

*Ibid.*, *Walmer Castle*, 7 September 1846.— . . . I don't see much chance of being able to remove the Whigs. If they have their difficulties we have ours. The schism is as great as ever; & I see no chance unless Peel shd. withdraw, which he will not do. If he were quite away there might be reunion; but the Party will never forgive him, or act with him. He will continue to attend the House, & to take part in the debates, sometimes supporting one Party, & sometimes the other; wch. will be most disastrous for the Party & for the country also.

Before I left London I had a visit from Bonham. He takes rather a more sanguine view than I do. He says that everybody is leaving Lord G. Bentinck, & he believes that the great mass of the Conservative Party will reunite. But I think he looks still to Sir R. Peel. I feel confident that as the leader of our Party there is an end of him, for nobody will ever trust him again. . . .

#### 240. John Wilson Croker to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Alverbank, Gosport*, 4 October 1846.—I was charmed with your letter—not merely with its contents—but the firmness & beauty of the handwriting, as well as the vivacity of the style, satisfy me that my *young* friend of 40 years standing is as young as ever, at least in those *indicative* points. What you say of the paper Brougham showed you gives me great satisfaction & confidence. It was a painful & difficult task—but I thought that I owed it to the Review (which, at Peel's desire, I had embarked in the cause)—to myself—to our party & to the country. What you have seen was rather a rough sketch: you will find it in the volume, less *décousu*, & I think more forcible.<sup>1</sup> I am not aware that I have exaggerated one jot—tho' I have passed over in silence many important points, because I thought them of a deeper culpability. I had a strong desire to do no more than was absolutely necessary. I shall never cease to lament that our great & good friend, when Peel chose to dissolve his Government in December—did not leave him there. Peel would then have been forced to throw off the mask at once & we should have been spared at least the apostasy of the 112.<sup>2</sup>

Give the Duke my best regards. I have been four days in town getting up the statue—its march was the grandest *spectacle* I ever saw.<sup>3</sup> Brougham wrote to me that 'he never saw that good, great & amiable man better.'

*Ibid.*, *Alverbank, Gosport*, 13 October 1846.—Your expressions were these—'that if he<sup>4</sup> could have a good reason for quitting office, he would never return to it again; not, that he would not be in office again, but that he never more would be in any Cabinet'. This, I think, justified the interpretation I put upon

<sup>1</sup> *Quarterly Review*, September 1846, pp. 535–80 ('The close of Sir Robert Peel's administration')

<sup>2</sup> The strength of the Peelite conservatives in the division on the Corn Laws, 27 February 1846 (*Parl. deb.*, 3rd series, lxxxiv. 354).

<sup>3</sup> Wyatt's colossal equestrian statue of the duke was removed from his studio in the Harrow Road to Hyde Park Corner at the end of September.

<sup>4</sup> Peel. See *Croker papers*, iii. 87 (Arbuthnot to Croker, 10 October).



it—tho' I readily agree that it could hardly have been your meaning & that some word has slipped in or slipped out to alter what you meant to convey.

You will have seen that the Review had adopted the same view that struck you—that he means to support the Whigs as an independent member—a most mischievous &, in fact, impracticable speculation. I hear that the Ministers are planning some great '*social reforms*' that even some of their own people boggle at. I have no guess what they are, except a compulsory system of public education—drainage of towns—parks—& minor matters of police they will easily carry, but education will be a harder struggle.

You may depend on what I have told you about the Duchy scheme, for I have seen it in Lord John's own hand. I dare say they will first speed a commission to investigate & will afterwards bring in a Bill—but of one thing you may be sure the object is to get more cash into the Privy Purse & at the same time propitiate some wavering politicians. Pray tell all this to the Duke.<sup>1</sup>

#### 241. Lord Brougham to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Chateau Eleanor, Cannes, 15 October [1846].*—I was prevented from dining at St. Cloud when in Paris (where I only slept a couple of nights) by a bowel disorder—which is incompatible with visits, especially royal visits . . . I saw M. Guizot for a few minutes, to beg he would excuse me to the King for not obeying his commands & dining. However, I had so little to tell that I did not trouble our great & excellent friend the F[ield] M[arshal] with a letter. However, I will now tell you anything that occurs—in order that you may tell him & save him the trouble of a letter.

I got here this day week, having come in four days, day & night. The weather has been delicious—& the frosts, but, today we have some rain. I stopt a couple of days at Ct. Molé's at Champlâtreux on my way to Paris—so that I have a good guess of what the parties are about on the *marriage* question—the only thing anyone, of course, talks or thinks of. They seem generally speaking agreed, & even those who don't like it, are much reconciled to it from the notion that England—or rather Palmerstone—will dislike it. His having been *over-reached* seems to give much satisfaction. Indeed his visit to Paris last spring (as I expected) only has made those who hated him, despise him. It was viewed as a kind of *peccavi*—an '*hommage*' which you know our French neighbours are mighty fond of supposing everybody very ready to render them. In short, he, Palmn., took nothing for that move.

As for the marriage<sup>2</sup> itself, I distinguish between the substance of the thing—& L[ouis] P[hilippe]'s way of doing it. The latter may be very much objected to—& I clearly think he had better have done it otherwise. The former—the substance of the thing—I profess I can see nothing in at all. The Utrecht

<sup>1</sup> In February 1847 five additional councillors were added to the council for the duchy of Lancaster, for the management of the revenues in the duchy (see *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, xc 514).

<sup>2</sup> On 10 October the duc de Montpensier, a younger son of Louis Philippe, married the younger sister of Queen Isabella of Spain.

arrangement is really of no kind of moment, for the very point was to prevent France and Spain from coming to the same person in circumstances which made that event very likely to happen. Hence there were practical renunciations of the two crowns in the event happening. But there never was—indeed never could be—a provision against alliances by marriage of remote heirs to these crowns. I must add that Guizot laughs at the story of there being no possibility of children. He said, ‘*La reine aura des enfans. Vous le verrez.*’ I asked if he had resolved to make them—he would not say that—but he positively denied that either she is barren or the man impotent. However—suppose both to be the case—then the fact is that D. de Montpensier has no less than *nine* between him and the French crown. I find too that there have been six instances since Utrecht of such alliances, & one of them a great deal stronger than the present—namely—1745. The Dauphin himself—son of Louis XV, married the daughter of Philip V, who was one of the heirs of the Spanish crown—& no objection was ever taken.

But I have given you marriage enough. I found Normanby—with whom I dined at Paris, entirely denying the meeting of Parlt. in Novr. It is supposed there was a Cabinet division & carried agt. it

I hear today from one to whom a French Minister told it—that J. Russell don’t expect any long life—nor do I think he will—but G. Bentinck contrives to be a powerful support I see. Give my kindest regards & respects to the Duke & believe me [&c].

[P.S.] Of course I am here at *single anchor* in case of Parlt. meeting. My accounts of the brougham accident are excellent All is well.

#### 242. The Earl of Ellesmere to Charles Arbuthnot.

*London, 8 December 1846.*— . . . We returned from Arundel on Saturday. The Duke will tell you that it went off very well, & a main satisfaction was that I never saw him better. . . . If it had been fitter for riding I should have seen more of the Duke, but as it was I only got a ride with him to meet the Queen . . . The whole affair was conducted with solid & unostentatious magnificence, & those who know the Queen’s ways say that she has enjoyed none of the great houses so much. She was as gracious as her singular poverty of small conversation & inaptitude for the social duties of her position allow her to be. Albert wants nothing but a little cordialty & unstiffening to make him an agreeable companion. I had occasion to be surprised with the extent & variety of the information he has accumulated, & I believe few men of his age & with his necessary distractions have read so generally or remember so much. It is a great point in his situation to have tastes which give him legitimate & refined occupation. He might otherwise in time escape & fall back on such *passe temps* as those of Geo. IV, which God forbid. He is the best shot I ever saw, though I think if I had three guns & men to load I could run him hard myself, for I find I can still beat all the young ones, & the Duke of Bedford was the only other gun of the party who would have had a chance with me. The Duke & I rode out to meet the Queen in a bitter frost, but he never even remarked

## 244 THE CORRESPONDENCE OF CHARLES ARBUTHNOT

that it was colder than usual. He executed the difficult manoeuvre of passing the carriage & escort after getting behind it in a frantic & mazeppalike manner, & though well mounted I had enough to do to keep [up] with him. . . .

### 243. The Earl of Dalhousie to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Tunbridge Wells, 29 June 1847.*—I sent for ‘Pitt & Peel’,<sup>1</sup> & have just read it. The author I do not know. It is certainly not Gladstone & hardly think it is Cardwell, altho’ it may be. I confess I do not think it is calculated to assume the aspect of an olive branch, & I am not surprised if it be the case that Stanley does not so regard it. It is a defence—& a fully successful one—not of Peel only but all his coadjutors, against the charges that in relinquishing protective duties they had been guilty of treason against Conservative tenets—that they were heretics from the Tory creed. The reference to Mr. Pitt’s commercial policy is a complete answer, & so we all have contended, so I contended last year in Parlt. However, the more successful the defence, the more the Protectionists must be in the wrong, & therefore it is that I conceive this pamphlet will not draw them towards reconciliation.

I am not captious, but this Govt. really is too incapable for flesh & blood to stand it; and I long for my lame leg to be well that I might bestow a kick from it upon them. I am mending slowly.

### 244. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*London, 7 August 1847.*— . . . I don’t know what I am to do in the autumn. I am on the best of terms with Sir R. Peel, but it will be painful to have a meeting with him, as I cannot but feel that he has destroyed our Party. I am no Protectionist; but had Sir Rt. been more conciliatory to his supporters, & more confidential towards them, none of the evil would have occurred. . . .

*Ibid., Walmer Castle, 18 August 1847.*— . . . Bonham writes to me that the two bodies of Conservatives will be 330; & that of this number Sir R. Peel will have 300. I don’t believe a word of it.

### 245. Lord Stanley to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Knowsley, 7 October 1847.*— . . . On my return home yesterday, I found a letter from Wilton enclosing a paper from you, which renders it incumbent upon me to trouble you with a communication, first to thank you for the trouble you have taken in explaining the Duke’s sentiments & feelings, and next to put you unreservedly in possession of my own. I cannot for a moment doubt the sincerity of the Duke’s attachment to the Conservative party; & he has given me many and repeated proofs of personal kindness and goodwill which I should be most ungrateful if I did not deeply feel. When he accepted the office of Commander-in-Chief, he was most kind in expressing his wish that I should endeavour to keep together a Conservative party in the House

<sup>1</sup> *The commercial policy of Pitt and Peel, 1783–1846* (pp 68 London, 1847). See *Quarterly Review*, June 1847, p. 274; and *Greville memoirs*, 22 July 1847.

of Lords ; and on the occasion to which you advert, that of the Irish peerage, now set at rest by the death of one of the candidates while the peer whom he was to replace still survives, he used his best exertions to bring those men upon whom he exercised personal influence to take the view which I did as to the choice of the new representation. I must also in fairness say that he has always shown himself most open and unreserved with me ; and I can easily understand that I may have appeared backward in reciprocating the confidence which he has shown himself willing to place in me. But the fact is, at least I have so felt it, that the Duke is in a very anomalous position ; and one in which it becomes a matter of extreme delicacy to communicate with him with that entire unreserve which I should otherwise hold it a high privilege to be allowed to use towards him. It is impossible not to be aware that on many of the leading questions which are to be discussed in Parliament, the Duke is previously consulted by the Government ; modifications are adopted at his suggestion, and communications take place which are very natural in the position which he occupies as Commander-in-Chief, bringing him into confidential intercourse with the members of the Cabinet—but this intercourse, natural as it is, renders it a matter of delicacy for me also, who have no such tie to the Government, and am avowedly in opposition to them, to consult with him on the same subjects, and thus to establish, as it were, an indirect communication in between two opposed political parties. I feel that in these cases the Duke cannot, and ought not to open his whole mind to me—I have no right to know what passes between him and the Queen's Ministers ; and without knowing it I cannot place myself in the position of viewing a question in the same light in which he looks at it. Thus, I have no doubt, the previous negotiations between the Duke & the Cabinet led to the course which he took in defending a measure which his influence had made less objectionable than he found it ; but which, as it stood, could not commend itself to my judgment, nor indeed to his own, nor that of any military man. The result of this state of things is that the Duke, with a strong partiality for the Conservative party, never appears in public except in opposition to it. Where he differs with the Government, he thinks it his duty to be silent ; where he thinks they ought to be supported he supports them warmly ; and this even in cases, as that of the Enlistment Bill, where the merits are against them. I do not say this by way of complaint ; but merely for the purpose of explaining the difficulty I feel, in my position, in taking counsel with the Duke, standing in that which he occupies : but I should be very sorry that my having abstained from frequent communication with him on public matters should have produced an impression in his mind that I was otherwise than sincerely grateful for the personal kindness with which he has always honoured me, and the confidence he has placed in me. Wilton was mistaken if he supposed that I attributed Dalhousie's appointment to any political connexion between either him or the Duke, and the Government—on the contrary, he wrote to me most frankly, and believing all his predilections to be with his old friends, I think his acceptance of office in India on the terms on which he has accepted it was both a prudent and a highly honourable course.

I am almost ashamed of the length of this communication which your kindness has brought upon you, and I do not know whether I have succeeded in conveying to you my feelings: I wished to do so without the least reserve; and I must trust to your discretion as to making this explanation, or any part of it, to the Duke himself. I am sure you will do that which you think best for setting me right with him.

#### 246. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Woodford, 3 December 1847.*—I have read Gleig's Waterloo.<sup>1</sup> The concluding part of it, & the end of [the] battle, is ill done, I think. The Duke told me that after ordering the advance, he halted the army for a short time, in order that they shd. all be up in rank. This Gleig doesn't mention. The Duke added that when arrived on the French position, he saw all the muskets & arms of the Reserve piled, which he had never in other victories witnessed, & which proved in what a panic the French must have run away.

I don't believe that Napoleon ever cried out, *saute qui peut*. Ouvrard told me that having the charge of providing for the French army, & his personal interests therefore being immense, he had gone from Paris to the field of battle, & that seeing one officer after another retiring, & at last seeing Napoleon himself move away, he felt it was time for him to be off. But Napoleon went without uttering a word. During the battle Ouvrard had asked Napoleon to give him some orders he required, & the answer always was, 'I will tell you this evening at Brussels.' I don't think Gleig's language so good as I had expected. He relates often without knowing the exact terms in which things had been said. At daybreak on the 18th June Napoleon said to Gen. Foy, 'I see that the English are off as I expected.' The General's reply was that this could not be known till the ridelles were driven in, for the Duke's way was to keep his troops concealed as much as he could. 'Gone or not gone, I shall beat them,' said Napoleon. Genl. Foy said that he had no doubt His I. Majesty wd. do all that man was capable of, *mais que les Anglais sont terribles en duel*. Gleig has not related this correctly. I had it from Sir J. Murray to whom Gen. Foy had told it. In other respects Gleig is not correct; but what I like least is the concluding part of the great battle. . . .

*Ibid., Woodford, 5 December 1847.*— . . . I should be obliged to read Gleig over again in order to make comments. I think that in other accounts of the battles of Ligny and Waterloo more distinct marks are given of Napoleon's dilatoriness after gaining the first battle, & of the waste of time before Grouchy recd. instructions to pursue the Prussians. What I particularly object to is the winding up of the whole after the French failed in their great effort to break thro' our centre. It might have been made more imposing & more true. Lord Anglesey was supported by the Duke after being wounded. He had just said to the Duke, 'You have won a great victory, & now you had better stop' The Duke replied that up to that time he had gained nothing but repulsing the French, & that he must go on till he had driven them away in such utter

<sup>1</sup> *The story of the battle of Waterloo (1847).*

confusion as to render their reassembling quite impossible. This I tell you, but you must not repeat it. The Duke told it me in confidence. I tell it because it is a lesson in military affairs. This only proves how little we might have done had Ld. Anglesey commanded. . . .

#### 247. Lord Brougham and Vaux to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Hotel [illegible]*, [1848].—1000 & 10,000 thanks, my dear *Gosh*. Your letter is a perfect treasure. But I differ with our dear Duke. He *ought* to have given such advice, & it is *quite constitutional*. As to the other parts of the case, you are at least in part wrong, for the Ch[ief] Baron's place is the Chancellor's *private patronage*, & he (as in the case of puisny [*sic*] Judges) does not even tell the P. Minister until he has taken the King's pleasure. This is to *avoid political jobbing*. When I determined to ask my old friend & comrade at the Bar, Lynd[hurs]t, to take it, I was obliged to deviate from the common rule, because if I had made a political enemy, Grey might have complained.<sup>1</sup> In general Judges are not politicians, so the rule in general don't lead to this inconvenience. But in this case it did. I spoke to Grey. He said, 'It is just what I myself should have wished you to do. But of course it is your affair'—& the violent Whigs—and Scarlett's friends—also abused me like a cutpurse.

My dear A., get the Duke to shew you a letter to him which goes by this post. It gives a private but *sure* account of things here, which are as bad as possible. I send it under cover to my *bankers*—for all letters are opened to known men. I send this so.

#### 248. Charles Arbuthnot to his son Charles.

*Sunday*, [March 1848].—Charles Greville called on me. He told me what he had heard from Ld. Aberdeen, who had already seen Guizot. Guizot said that the whole catastrophe was entirely owing to the King; & that there would have been no difficulty whatever in quelling the disturbances. When Guizot was in the Chambers on *Wednesday* M. Duchatel came to him & told him that the King wanted to see him immediately. Guizot asked what the King wanted, as he had seen him recently; and Duchatel replied that he had no notion. 'Well,' said Guizot, 'I will go, but you must go with me.'

They went, & the King told him that some Colonel or Commandant of the National Guard had been with him, & that the aspect of affairs was very serious. The two Ministers endeavoured to combat this opinion; but the King with vast professions of regard ended by saying that he must change his Ministers; upon which they declared their readiness to *retire*, as his My. thought it necessary.

<sup>1</sup> Lyndhurst, who had been lord chancellor since April 1827, accepted Brougham's offer of the office of chief baron of the exchequer in December 1830. Brougham was not really entitled to take sole credit for this excellent appointment, for the suggestion came from Grey himself (6 December 1830); Brougham said the proposition was 'rather startling to me', and that 'the only justification for appointing him was his undoubted fitness for the office', (Brougham's *Memoirs*, iii. 85-8).

He said that he shd. send for Molé. He did send for him, who required time.

Hours passed away without receiving any notice from Molé ; upon which the King sent for him again. Molé then said that he had not succeeded, but he should be able to answer definitely the next morning. That is, on *Thursday morning*. But the King told him that there was not a moment to lose ; & he sent at once for Thiers. Thiers said that if he had Odillon Barrot as his colleague, & that if the King wd. authorise him to say that the troops should not act for 12 hours, he would answer for the restoration of tranquillity. To all that Thiers required, the King agreed readily.

Thiers & Odillon Barrot went to the great crowds of people ; but they were assailed with the general cry that it was too late, & that they were resolved on the abdication of the King. They went & reported to the King their failure.

The King was then urged to abdicate. He was doubtful what to do. The Duke de Montpensier implored the King to sign his abdication. The Queen like a heroine urged him not to abdicate, but to mount his horse, & rather to die at the head of the troops than to dishonour himself by abdication. But on abdication the King finally resolved. We know all the rest.

Ch. Greville says that the conduct of Lamartine has been perfect. He it was who proposed to the others of the Provisional Government the abolition of death for political acts. The others positively refused to agree to this. The following morning he proposed it again, & said that if they still refused their assent he would resign, & they might begin by putting him to death. Then they did consent. Lamartine wrote a private note to Guizot to let him know that if he did not feel himself in safety he begged him to come to his house where he should be sure of protection.

But no one feels that the present tranquillity can continue. One of the Barings writes from Paris, stating that no business is done, that the shops are open, but that nothing is sold. And the paying of 24,000 vagabonds as additional National Guards is an additional expense which cannot long be borne ; & that the belief is that the French will be reduced to devour each other, or to fall on other nations in order to devour them.

Ch. Greville thinks it impossible that *our* present Government can last. Nothing, he says, can be more unpopular than they are—that Lord John made a fatal blunder in the Hampden affair ; <sup>1</sup> that his speech on finance has done him great mischief ; that the state of his health also is greatly against him ; and that nothing can equal the unpopularity of Sir Chs. Wood. The inference that he draws is that Sir Rt. Peel will soon be Minister.

I stated my reasons for being of a different opinion, particularly his alarm about his health ; but he was positive that ere long it wd. come to this, & the more so as, to a man, the Radicals had declared against the present Ministers.

Ch. Greville had been with Mme. de Lieven, & had heard all her story, in which, however, there was nothing beyond what we have known already. He is very intimate with Guizot, whom he is going to see. . . .

One thing, & one only, I have omitted to mention.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hampden, who was accused of unorthodox opinions, was appointed bishop of Hereford by Lord John Russell.

Guizot told Ld. Aberdeen that for these last two years he has found the King much altered in his general intellect; that at times he has found him as shrewd as ever, but that in general he has found his mind much altered for the worse. In this last act he lost his head entirely, & that nothing was apparent but fear and agitation.

*Ibid.*, London, 25 March 1848 *Most confidential*.—You are quite mistaken in thinking that the K. of P[russia] is a great Liberal. Unfortunately he has no strength of mind, & has acted most weakly. The troops had quelled all the riots, when the King gave orders for the army to quit Berlin—and this from weakness. . . . P. Albert is highly pleased at the downfall of Metternich, & at all that has occurred in Germany. He says that the King of P. has not conceded enough!!!

*Ibid.*, London, 11 April 1848.—Never was anything more successful than yesterday's result. The Duke had made the most perfect arrangements.<sup>1</sup> Not a soldier was seen; but every man was close at hand if the mob had been too much for the police.

Guizot is in admiration & astonishment! He could not have believed it possible. It will have a gt. effect on the continent. . . .

*Ibid.*, London, 12 May 1848.— . . . The Duke saw P. Metternich yesterday, & was told by him that the Venetian States wished to be again reunited to Austria, & that the great mass of the people has never liked separation. He also said that the army under Radetzky was the finest possible, & that he had no fear of the result. . . .

*Ibid.*, London, 4 June 1848.— . . . I am quite sure that my plan of silence on the rail road is the best. I had with me two respectable gentlemen. One of [them], a clergyman, talking with the other, found fault with the Duke for making Philpotts Bishop of Exeter<sup>2</sup> in consequence of the hatred wch. the Bishop had manifested to Canning. I knew that he was in error as to the motive of making him, as it had been with the full sanction of the late Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>3</sup> I could not resist telling the clergyman that he was entirely mistaken as to the motive, for that I knew all that had passed.

He took it very civilly & said that he was glad to have been set right; but from that moment till I got to Euston Square it led to discussion upon a variety of subjects, & I thought of you when I promised to myself that I wd. never again volunteer talking on the rail road. . . .

## 249. The Duke of Wellington to Charles Arbuthnot.

London, 16 June 1848.—I have not heard one word of news! I am inclined to think that if Napoleon Louis is quiet and acts in concert with Thiers the Govt. will fall into his hands.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> To preserve order in London during the great Chartist demonstration.

<sup>2</sup> In 1830.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Howley had died on 11 February.

<sup>4</sup> Louis Napoleon had recently been elected a member of the constituent assembly, and in December he became president of the French republic.



## 250. The Earl of Dalhousie to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Govt. House*,<sup>1</sup> 7 September 1848. *Private*.— . . . Never man found a state of things more different fm. what was proclaimed than I have done—war for peace; & instead of equalised income and expenditure, a deficiency of £1,400,000 together with a demand fm. the Court<sup>2</sup> for half a million sterling in *specie*, the SECOND I have been called upon to send since I assumed the Govt. 8 months ago!

I am obliged to have recourse to the recollection of 'Ah well, it can't be helped; it don't signify', for comfort under such circumstances. Lady Dalhousie, you will be glad to hear, has been well on the whole since she came to India. Lately, she has not been so well & has gone to the mouth of the river for change of air, wh. I hope will set her up. I expect her back shortly.

This country is odious to me; but I have undertaken the task and I shall not shirk it.

## 251. Lord Brougham and Vaux to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Walmer C[astle]*, *Sunday* [22 October 1848].—I am grieved to find you gone. The D[uke] is better than ever & in great force—but is much annoyed with the accts. of the D. at Durham (I fear fatal).<sup>3</sup> Ch. W.<sup>4</sup> is gone down & this was the only way to prevent the D. (which God forbid!) going himself.

I was much interested with your letter to Cowley on parties, & I could have confirmed many of your views and of your very sagacious conjectures. I meant to thank you, but Ly. D[ouros] promised to tell you my thanks. I fear she has never seen you once.

Pray do you happen to know whether the King (W[illiam] 4)'s story to me was fancy or true, or, as often happens, a mixture of both—namely that when the Conservatives went out, Novr. 1830, they recommended him not to leave me in the H. of Com[mon]s—which the Rolls would. He certainly refused that place & astonished Grey by saying he had no objection to my having the Great Seal—and he always told me *I was his Ch[anceller]* as Geo. 3, whom he was fond of imitating, told Eldon. Mind—I think the advice quite sound & proper to be given—for a leader of the Whigs—M.P. for Yorkshire, & in a high irremovable place—would have overset everything. But how is it?

[P.S.] Of course no one shall know your answer to my question.<sup>5</sup>

## 252. The Earl of Ellesmere to Charles Arbuthnot.

8 February 1849.—I feel very confident that if you could find time to read Layard's book,<sup>6</sup> you would understand the interest which I take in the fortunes of a man I never saw. His exploits are not to be measured by our utilitarian

<sup>1</sup> Calcutta.

<sup>2</sup> The court of directors.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Wellesley, canon of Durham, the duke's brother, died at Durham on the 21st.

<sup>4</sup> Probably Dr. Wellesley's son Charles.

<sup>5</sup> See my *Lord Brougham and the whig Party*, pp. 185–6.

<sup>6</sup> *Nineveh and its remains*.

standard, but even if I were to agree with that savage Joseph Hume, who at the B. Museum gravely told me yesterday that he considered we spent too much money on antiques, I could shew that in a mere profit & loss account they would make no poor figure. He has been assisted, towards the transport of the Niniveh marbles to England, to about the amount of £3000 which is all they have cost the country. The obelisk alone, which one day you must see, has been valued at £10,000, & no one has put the value of the collection at less than £40,000. No man, I presume, of any pretension to cultivation, no civilized being except Joseph Hume, if he be one, would measure the value of objects which illustrate passages of history at once important & obscure, by an utilitarian standard, & certainly among the subjects a rational curiosity would most desire to rescue from obscurity those of the Assyrian Empire must rank with the highest. The discovery, & the most able & successful exploration of the palaces of the successive dynasties of that Empire, constitute the greatest achievement of our time in *pari materia*. The man who has done all this, & who has told the story of his achievements with singular modesty & simplicity, has damaged his health, spent his money, & is now an unpaid attaché at Constantinople. To my apprehension he is cast in the same mould as the Indian Edwardes.<sup>1</sup> Sir S[tratfor]d Canning, a man sagacious enough & not easy to please, says he thinks Macaulay & Layard the two cleverest men he has ever met with. As far as I am informed Layard is, for reasons of health, not disposed at present to recommence his researches, though I understand he *was* very anxious to pursue them at Babylon where there is much to be done. He has, however, talents for his present profession, he has mastered several of the Eastern languages & has been employed on several local missions, one in particular, I believe, to Albania, & he is anxious to continue & get forward in diplomacy. I really think that Ld. Palmerstone, who, I understand, shewed him personal kindness & consideration lately in England, would do himself much honour on the Continent as well as here by bringing forward such a man. . . .

### 253. Viscount Palmerston to Charles Arbuthnot.

*C[arlton] G[ardens]*, 13 February 1849.—I thank you much for sending me this letter from Ld. Ellesmere, and I can assure you that I quite share the interest which you and Ld. E. feel about Mr. Layard. He is certainly a very extraordinary man, and his enterprising exertions have accomplished very remarkable and important results: I shall certainly not fail to keep him in view, and shall be glad to avail myself of any opportunity that may present itself, of turning his qualities to good account. . . .

### 254. The Earl of Dalhousie to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Simla*, 23 May 1849. *Private*.—Sir Chas. Napier arrived in Calcutta on 6th inst. and sent me yr. letter of March 23.

He assumed at once the command of the Army, as I anticipated he would

<sup>1</sup> Sir Herbert Benjamin Edwardes.

do. Lord Gough, having continued to the last to expect that Sir C. Napier wd not take the command until he (Ld. G.) laid it down, was mortified accordingly. Sir C. N., however, has in all respects shewn every desire to be considerate to Ld. G., & has expressed himself at Calcutta in such a manner as to have given pleasure to Ld. G. The latter bears the thing manfully & well, without shrinking & without bluster. I have desired that the usual honours of C. in C. shall be paid to him so long as he remains in India. Sir C. N. has done the same to the Army; & I am sure everybody will do all they can to shew him respect.

Sir Charles is now on his way to Simla, and I shall be very glad to see him here; for there is much to be done. I was very glad to observe the cheery tone wh. the Duke took at the dinners. I am very sure that nothing I have ever done or said here gave countenance to the panic wh. seized the public. I need hardly add that the Duke being satisfied with my instructions as to *where* the war was to be carried on, & with the result, is the greatest comfort I can have.

I see my predecessor<sup>1</sup> has been telling the old story of 54,000 men & 120 guns having been left *on the frontier* by him. He does not tell them that these 50,000 men included everything as far back as Meerut & DELHI. The gaping multitude of course takes in, that at least 50,000 men & 100 guns were available to be moved into the Punjab at once: & consequently that little credit is due to the G.G. & C. in C. who, with such a force as that laid all ready to their hands by Ld. Hardinge, have beaten the Sikhs on their own ground.

Ld. H. knows right well that I had no more 50,000 men *for the field* than I had 500,000, merely because there were 50,000 between the Indus & Delhi. With the Duke & soldiers this is easily detected: not so with the public. . . .

### 255. Sir Robert Peel to Charles Arbuthnot.

*Drayton Manor, 31 July [1849].*— . . . Wood succeeds very well in a speech of which he has had the requisite time to collect the materials—but one could not infer from that, that he would have the qualifications necessary in a leader of the House of Commons. He made two excellent speeches this session—on the two motions of the Protectionist party—burdens on land, and State of the Nation.<sup>2</sup> I think the Protectionists, even with the aid of Lord Aberdeen, could not conduct the government of this country—that is to say—if they adhered to their professed principles, and retained the goodwill of such men as the Duke of Richmond, Lord Winchilsea & the Duke of Newcastle. To be sure, if they adhered to their professed principles on protection, they could not well have Aberdeen's aid.

*Ibid., Drayton Manor, 6 December [1849].*—I share in the horror of war expressed in Lord Spencer's letter—but I am sure we must be very careful in conducting our relations with France—that the horror of war does not involve us in the practical calamity. It is easy to descant on the folly of two great

<sup>1</sup> Sir Henry Hardinge, Viscount Hardinge, governor-general of India, 1844–8.

<sup>2</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, clii. 702 (14 March), and cvi. 1172. (2 July).

empires like England and France falling out about Tahiti, and Mr. Pritchard.<sup>1</sup> It was said at the time that the language I held in the House of Commons respecting the Tahiti affair nearly involved the two countries in war—but I held the language deliberately, from a firm conviction that an *undue* concession to France in a matter, even of trivial interest, intrinsically, would be more likely to lead to war than a firm and temperate assertion of an unquestionable right—and that to have the double evil of humiliation first and war afterwards was of all issues the worst.<sup>2</sup> Our position in regard to France is and will, I fear, continue to be one of great delicacy and difficulty. Immediate vicinage—the natural temperament of the French people—and above all our past success by sea and land—have a tendency to check (though I hope they will never countervail) the influences of reason and good sense, and the manifest reciprocal interest of the two countries to be at peace, and indeed on friendly terms.

We are much in the same position as a nation, in which a quiet respectable man stands towards a very sensitive, quarrelsome neighbour, over whom he has had an advantage the recollection of which is very painful.

When my old friend James Daly came of age and was about to stand for the county of Galway—his friends advised him deliberately to inform Dick Martin, a rival candidate, that it was his wish to be on friendly terms with Martin, but that he foresaw many points on which they might come into collision, and that foreseeing the possibility that Martin from his age and established reputation as a duellist, might assume a tone to which a young man could not properly submit, Daly thought it right to inform him that he should fight Martin on the first provocation. All this was done with great courtesy—and professedly in the spirit of peace, and the timely communication, though savouring rather of Galway policy than of strict Christian duty, had the full effect which it was intended to have.

If France thought we were disposed to shrink, from the maintenance of any really just claim—she would quickly assume the tone which it was thought Martin would assume. One Tahiti case, dishonorably settled, would quickly beget another, and the spirit of this country—however averse to war—would not tolerate, and ought not to tolerate, the assumption of superiority by France in a succession of little matters.

All this, however, tends to prove the necessity of combining with our firmness the greatest temper and moderation, and of carefully avoiding to give any just cause of offence or jealousy to other Powers, by too much of apparent or real intimacy with a neighbour so susceptible, so inconstant—so jealous of our power and reputation, so disposed to attribute to some selfish motive the professions and even the acts of friendship—and to leave us in the lurch on the first divergence of our interests.

I was greatly pleased with my visit to Woburn—surprized at the extent to which mechanical skill is combined with agricultural improvement, and admiring the wise and benevolent preparations for the comfort and the moral welfare of the labouring classes. It is a noble use of great wealth. . . .

<sup>1</sup> See *Cambridge hist. of British foreign policy*, ii. 182–5.

<sup>2</sup> *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd series, lxxvi. 1575 (31 July 1844).

## 256. The Earl of Ellesmere to Charles Arbuthnot.

*London, 6 December 1849.*— . . . Louis Napoleon rises in estimation. Flahault & others who have been to Paris speak highly of his whole conduct in the late change of Ministry. There is a general feeling in France that a blow is necessary for its salvation from chaos. Thiers proposed an addition of ten years to the President's tenure. He replied, wisely I think, that it was not worth while to violate the Constitution for an incomplete arrangement. I hear he is much plagued with Normanby's <sup>1</sup> ill-judged endeavours to afficher intimacy with him, & influence. . . .

## 257. John Wilson Croker to [Charles] Greville.

15 *June 1850.*—If my old friend Arbuthnot is well enough to be spoken to about old stories, I should wish very much to ask him a question which he can best of all men answer.

When Castlereagh & Canning published their rival statements & correspondence in 1809, Mr. Perceval also had copies made of his correspondence which he showed to all of us who then took part with him, and amongst others to Robert Ward. Ward, it seems, made a précis of this correspondence & copies of part of it which his nephew Phipps has just published as part of Ward's Memoirs.<sup>2</sup> They are of course creditable—very—to Mr. Perceval's memory, & I am glad they are published, & I even wish they had been in extenso—but I doubt whether Ward had Mr. Perceval's leave to make a transcript. I know he begged of me not to do so. I should like to know what Arbuthnot says on this point or whether he has a copy of the original paper. I should not be surprised if the Duke should remember. Perhaps Ward might have been permitted to make his transcript to send to Lord Lonsdale who was much regarded & consulted in those days.<sup>3</sup> At all events I shall be glad to hear how dear Arbuthnot is . . .

<sup>1</sup> British ambassador to France.

<sup>2</sup> Edmund Phipps, *Memoirs of the political and literary life of Robert Plumer Ward*, 2 vols. Croker reviewed the book in the *Quarterly*, June 1850, pp. 239–76.

<sup>3</sup> Lord Lonsdale was proprietor of the borough of Haslemere, for which Plumer Ward sat in parliament.

## INDEX

[The numbers refer to the letter, not the page      Where letters are grouped together the second is indexed A, the third B, and so on]

Abercromby, James, first Baron Dunfermline (1776-1858), 206.  
 Aberdeen, fourth Earl of (1784-1860), 23A, 111, 121, 127, 156A, 175, 216, 223B, 237, 248, 255.  
 Acland, Sir Thomas Dyke (1787-1871), 226A.  
 A'Court, Sir William, first Baron Heytesbury (1779-1860), British Minister to Spain, 59.  
 Adelaide, Queen of William IV (1792-1849), 151, 156A, 213A.  
*Age, the*, 142.  
 Aix-la-Chapelle, Congress of, 12.  
 Alava, General (1770-1843), 53-4, 66.  
 Albert, Prince-Consort of England (1819-1861), 216, B; 236, 242, 248A.  
*Albion, the*, 142.  
 Althorp, Viscount. *See* Spencer, third Earl.  
 Ancram, Earl of, afterwards seventh Marquess of Lothian (1794-1841), 30.  
 Anglesey, Henry William Paget, first Marquess of (1768-1854), 83, 109, 114-16, 141, 147, 148A, 161, 177A, C; 246A.  
 Anne, Queen (1665-1714), 216.  
 Anti-Corn Law League, 229.  
 Apsley, Henry, Viscount, afterwards fourth Earl Bathurst (1790-1866), 30, 83A.  
 Arabin, Captain, 10.  
 Arbuthnot, Alexander (1768-1828), Charles Arbuthnot's brother, and Bishop of Killaloe, 27.  
 Arbuthnot, Caroline (1802-72), daughter of Right hon. Charles Arbuthnot, 205F.  
 Arbuthnot, Right hon. Charles (1767-1850), 33, 41, 62, 74, 97, 99, 112, 116, 140, 145, 150A, 152, 161, 171, 257.  
*Memo.*, 159.

*Letters from* : 1, 13, 15, 19, 20, 24, 28, 36, 45, 61, 63, 67-8, 71, 84, 100, 107, 111, 113, 118, 128, 134, 137, 142, 153, 155-6, 163, 165, 167-9, 173, 177, 179-182, 184, 187, 192-3, 197, 199, 201, 203, 205, 214, 224, 239, 244, 246, 248.  
*Letters to* : 2-7, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21-3, 26-7, 29-32, 34-5, 37-40, 42-4, 46, 49, 51-2, 58, 60, 64, 66, 69, 70, 72-3, 75-7, 79-81, 83, 86-8, 90-1, 93, 95, 104, 108-10, 114-15, 121-7, 129-30, 132, 147, 157, 164, 166, 175, 186, 194, 196, 198, 200, 206-13, 215-23, 225-38, 240-3, 245, 247, 249-56.  
 rumour that he was to be Irish Secretary (1812), 4, 6.  
 circular letters despatched by, 12  
 financial position, 13  
 sends King reports of Commons' debates, 15  
 offered office of Colonial Agent for Ceylon, 52B, 58  
 his pension 140, 142B, 163, 175, 181, 192-4, 197-8, 201A.  
 Arbuthnot, General Charles George (1801-1870), Charles Arbuthnot's elder son, 58, 143A, 193, 216A.  
*Letters to* : 20, 24, 84, 113, 118, 128, 137, 153, 155, 163, 165, 167, 169, 173, 177, 179, 181, 184, 187, 192, 197, 201, 203, 205, 214, 224, 239, 244, 246, 248.  
 Arbuthnot, George (1802-65), son of Sir Robert Arbuthnot, Charles Arbuthnot's brother, 170.  
 Arbuthnot, Harriett (1793-1834), Charles Arbuthnot's second wife, 12, 67, 67A, 90, 95, 137, 163B, 193, 198, 205H.  
*Letters from* : 52, 64, 66, 75, 132, 143, 175.  
*Letters to* : 15, 25, 28, 61, 74, 78, 82, 85, 89, 92, 94, 96-9, 101-3, 105-7, 112, 116-17, 119-20, 133, 135-6, 138-42.

- Arbuthnot—*Letters to* : (*continued*)  
 144-6, 148-52, 154, 156, 158, 160-2, 168, 171-2, 174, 176, 178, 182-3, 185, 190-1, 195
- Arbuthnot, Henry (1803-75), Charles Arbuthnot's second son, 132
- Arbuthnot, Marcia (d. 1806), Charles Arbuthnot's first wife, 205H.
- Ashburton, Lord. *See* Baring, Alexander.
- Ashley, Antony Ashley Cooper, Lord, afterwards seventh Earl of Shaftesbury (1801-85), 124-5, 149-50, 150A, 150B, C; 151, 158, 161, 226A.
- Letters from* : 94, 96, 102, 105.
- Athenæum, the, 145.
- Attwood, Thomas (1783-1856), Birmingham banker, political and currency reformer, 67
- Auckland, first Baron (1744-1814), British Ambassador to Spain, 1788-90, 1.
- Auckland, second Baron (1784-1849), 93, 208A
- Backhouse, John, 29A
- Bagot, Sir Charles (1781-1843), Governor-General of Canada, 232.
- Bailey, 94
- Baird, General Sir David (1757-1829), 171.
- Baker, Sir Edward (1806-77), 150C.
- Banks, M.P., 40A
- Banks, Henry (1757-1834), 149-50, 157
- Banks, William John (d. 1855), second son of Henry Banks, 149-50.
- Letter from* : 158.
- Banks family, 120, 149.
- Bankhead, Dr Charles, Castlereagh's physician, 30
- Barclay, Charles, M.P. for Surrey, 206.
- Baring family, 248.
- Baring, Alexander, first Baron Ashburton (1774-1848), 67, 227C.
- Baring, Henry, Alexander Baring's brother (1776-1848), 167.
- Baring, Sir Thomas (1772-1848), 170
- Baring, William Bingham, second Baron Ashburton (1799-1864), 227B.
- Barnes, Thomas (1785-1841), editor of *The Times*, 74.
- Barrot, Odilon (1791-1873), 248.
- Bath, second Marquess of (1765-1837), 15A.
- Bathurst, Charles Bragge (d. 1831), 13.
- Bathurst, Georgina, Countess (d. 1841), wife of third Earl, 30, 90.
- Bathurst, Lady Georgiana Louisa (d. 1874), Lord Bathurst's elder daughter, 90, 158.
- Bathurst, Henry, third Earl (1762-1834), 16, 19, 23A, 28A, 31A, 34, 45, 49, 52B, 68, 87, 139A
- Letters from* : 30, 39, 43, 58, 60, 70, 77, 83, 90, 108, 114
- Beaucherk, Aubrey William, M.P. for East Surrey, 203B
- Beckett, Sir John, Judge Advocate-General in Liverpool Ministry, 170.
- Bedford, John Russell, sixth Duke of (1766-1839), 200, 203C, 205B, C
- Bedford, seventh Duke of (1788-1861), 89, 205B, 225, 239, 242.
- Letters from* : 157, 200.
- Letter to* : 199
- Bell, 208A.
- Bellew, 130.
- Bentinck, Lord George (1802-48), second surviving son of fourth Duke of Portland, 30, 239, 239A, B; 241.
- Beresford, William Carr, Viscount (1768-1854), 103.
- Berkeley, 180.
- Bernal, Ralph, 22.
- Bull of Pains and Penalties, 15, 15A.
- Bingham, George Charles, Viscount, afterwards third Earl of Lucan (1800-88), 113
- Birmingham Political Union, 155.
- Bisset, William (1758-1834), Bishop of Raphoe, 27.
- Blackwood, Vice-Admiral Sir Henry (1770-1832), 148.
- Blomfield, Charles James, Bishop of London (1786-1857), 150B.
- Bloomfield, Sir Benjamin, first Baron Bloomfield (1768-1846), Keeper of the Privy Purse, and George IV's private secretary, 7, 10, 15, 21, 29A.
- Letter to* : 11 n.
- Bloomfield, Harriet, Lady, 10.
- Bolívar, Simon (1783-1830), 63
- Bonaparte *See* Napoleon.
- Bone, Henry (1755-1834), enamel painter, 74, 169C.
- Bonham, Francis Robert, M.P., Conservative Whip, 206, 233, 239A, B, 244A.
- Bradshaw, James, M.P. for Canterbury, 213
- Brazil, Emperor of. *See* Pedro I.
- British Museum, 252.
- Brooks' Club, 93, 103.
- Brougham, Henry, Lord (1778-1868), 86-87, 96, 103, 139, 142B, 151, 170, 175, 177, 185, 185A, 189-90, 199-200, 204, 205E, 207, 210, 212, 215, 234, 240.
- Letters from* : 241, 247, 251

- Brownlow, Charles, M.P. for Armagh Co., 12.  
 Brownlow, first Earl (1779-1853), 158.  
 Brownlow, Lady, 141  
 Brudenell, Viscount, afterwards seventh Earl of Cardigan (1797-1868), Conservative M.P. for Northamptonshire, 173, 173A.  
 Brunswickers, the, 134  
 Buccleugh, fifth Duke of (1806-84), 158, 173, 180, 238  
 Buckingham and Chandos, first Duke of (1776-1839), 44, 69, 142, 142B, 161, 175, 185, 185A, B  
 Buddle, 141.  
 Buller, Charles (1806-48), Lord Durham's secretary in Canada, 207  
 Buller, Sir John Yarde-, first Baron Churston (1799-1871), M.P. for South Devon, 216B  
 Bülow, Prussian Minister in London, 150.  
 Bulwer, William Henry Lytton, Baron Dalling and Bulwer (1801-72), 229  
 Burdett, Sir Francis (1770-1844), Radical M.P. for Westminster, 67A, 151, 212, 215, 226A.  
 Burghersh, Lord, afterwards eleventh Earl of Westmorland (1784-1859), 221.  
 Burghersh, Priscilla Anne, Lady, wife of Lord Burghersh (d. 1879), 203, 218.  
 Burke, 26B.  
 Bushe, Charles Kendal (1767-1843), 26B.  
 Byng, Sir John, Earl of Strafford (1772-1860), 200A.  
 Calcraft, John, M.P. (1765-1831), 151.  
 Calthorpe, third Baron (1787-1851), 18B.  
 Cambridge, Adolphus Frederick, Duke of (1774-1850), seventh son of George III, 28, 212.  
 Cambridge, Duchess of (1797-1889), 212.  
 Cambridgeshire election (1831), 153, 153A.  
 Camden, first Marquess of (1759-1840), 86, 95, 161  
 Campbell, Sir John, first Baron Campbell (1779-1861), 216B.  
 Campbell, Walter, M.P., 223C.  
 Canning, George (1770-1827), 13, 18, 18A, 19, 23C, 27A, 28, A; 29A, 30-1, 31A, 32B, D; 34, 36-7, 42, 45-6, 49, 58, 60-1, 63, 68-70, 70A, 76, 83, 83A, 84, 86-7, 88A, 90-1, 94, 97, 100-1, 103, 111, 113, 120, 127, 134, 200, 248D, 257 negotiations for return to office, July 1812, 5.  
*Letters from* : 5, 35, 38, 40, 54, 56.  
*Letters to* : 53, 55, 57.  
 Canning, Joan, Lady, George Canning's wife (d. 1837), 103.  
 Canning, Sir Stratford, first Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe, British Ambassador to Turkey (1786-1880), 252.  
 Canterbury, Archbishop of *See* Howley, William.  
 Cardwell, Edward, Viscount (1813-86), 243.  
 Carlisle, George Howard, sixth Earl of (1773-1848), 120.  
 Carlton Club, 156, 162, 163A, B; 177B, 207, 218, 223  
 Carnarvon, second Earl of (1772-1833), 83A, 166, 175.  
 Caroline, Queen (1768-1821), 14-15, 15A, 16, 18A, 22.  
 Cartwright, 158  
 Castlereagh, Viscount, afterwards second Marquess of Londonderry (1769-1822), 5, 6, 14-15, 15A, 16, 18A, 19-20, 23A, 30-1, 33, 36, 98, 101, 103, 113, 135, 187, 257.  
*As Leader of House of Commons*, 13, 46.  
*Letters from* : 12, 22, 25-6  
*Letters to* : 13.  
 Castlereagh, Viscount, afterwards fourth Marquess of Londonderry (1805-72), 120.  
 Catholic Association, the, 109-10  
 Chalmers, Dr Thomas (1780-1847), theologian, 216.  
 Chancellor, Lord *See* Eldon.  
 Chandos, Lord, afterwards second Duke of Buckingham and Chandos (1797-1861), 38, 143, 143A, 194, 206, 226A.  
 Chaplin, Charles, 210E.  
 Charles II, King of Great Britain (1630-1685), 98.  
 Charles X, King of France (1757-1836), 63, 133.  
 Charles Street, the Tory party-headquarters, 150, 158, 186.  
 Childe, William Lacon, M.P. for Wenlock, 40.  
 Cholmondeley, Lord Henry, third Marquess of (1800-84), 40A  
 Cholmondeley, Susan, Marchioness of, wife of second Marquess (d. 1886), 143A  
 Civil List (1820), 14, 26C.  
 Clancarty, second Earl of (1767-1837), 31, 126  
 Clanwilliam, third Earl of (1795-1879), 25, 28A, 30, 86.  
 Clare, Elizabeth, Countess of, 119



- Clare, John Fitzgibbon, second Earl of (1792-1851), 119.  
 Clarence, Duke of. *See* William IV.  
 Clarendon, fourth Earl of (1800-70), 223A.  
 Clay, Sir William (1791-1869), Tory M.P. for Tower Hamlets, 170.  
 Cleveland, William Harry Vane, third Earl of Darlington and first Duke of (1766-1842), 101.  
 Clinton, eighteenth Baron (1787-1832), 142A.  
 Coburg family, the, 214.  
 Cockburn, Admiral Sir George (1772-1853), 108A, 110.  
 Codrington, Admiral Sir Edward (1770-1851), victor of Navarino, 94, 148B.  
 Colborne, Sir John, first Baron Seaton (1778-1863), 205G, 206.  
 Coleridge, Henry Nelson (1798-1843), S. T. Coleridge's nephew, 145.  
 Compton, Mrs., 143A.  
 Condé, Louis, Prince de (1756-1830), 156A.  
 Conroy, Sir John (1786-1854), 211.  
 Conyngham, Elizabeth, Marchioness (d. 1861), 23B, 24, 52B.  
 Conyngham, Lord Francis Nathaniel, second Marquess of Conyngham (1797-1876), 28A, 45, 60-1, 83A.  
 Conyngham, Henry, first Marquess (1766-1832), 21, 23C.  
 Conyngham family, the, 80.  
 Copland, 213.  
 Copley, Sir John Singleton, Lord Lyndhurst (1772-1863), 74, 86, 97A, 139A, 164, 166, 170, 175, 185A, 203C, 221A, 247.  
 Cornwallis, Charles, first Marquess (1774-1823), 79A.  
 Cortes, the, 6.  
 Country gentlemen, the, 13.  
 Courtenay, William, M.P. for Exeter, afterwards Earl of Devon (1777-1859), 13, 70A.  
 Cowley, Georgina, Lady, wife of Lord Cowley (d. 1860), 127, 134.  
 Cowley, Lord. *See* Wellesley, Sir Henry.  
 Cowper, Emily, Lady. *See* Palmerston, Lady.  
 Cowper, Lady Emily, afterwards Lady Shaftesbury (d. 1872), 124-5.  
 Cowper, William Francis, first Baron Mount-Temple (1811-88), Whig M.P. for Hertford, Melbourne's nephew and private secretary, 209-10.  
 Crampton [<sup>?</sup> Crompton], 141.  
 Craven, Richard Keppel (1779-1851), Queen Caroline's Vice-Chamberlain, 16.  
 Crighton, 52A.  
 Crockford's, 105, 172.  
 Croker, John Wilson (1780-1857), 64A, 110, 140, 142B, 175, 178, 188, 213, 215.  
*Letters from*: 144, 152, 171, 240, 257.  
 Croker, Mrs., 64A.  
 Cumberland, Duke of (1771-1851), 120, 126, 128, 134, 148B, 165, 183, 185, A.  
 Curtis, Patrick, Archbishop of Armagh (1740-1832), 115-16.  
 Dalhousie, first Marquess of (1812-60), 227B, 231, 238, 245.  
*Letters from* 233, 243, 250, 254.  
 Dalhousie, Lady (d. 1853), 250.  
 Dalton, 142A, B.  
 Daly, James, afterwards Lord Dunsandle (d. 1847), M.P. for Galwayshire, 38, 255A.  
 Darby, George, M.P. for East Sussex, 226A.  
 Darlington, Lord, afterwards second Duke of Cleveland (1788-1864), 226A.  
 Dawson, George Robert, M.P., 95, 108A, 110.  
 Decazes, Duc (1780-1860), French Ambassador in London, 15.  
 Decken, Mme de, 25.  
 Demson, Edmund, 238A.  
 Denison, John Evelyn, first Viscount Ossington (1800-73), 83A.  
 Denison, William Joseph, M.P. for Surrey (1770-1849), 206.  
 Derby, twelfth Earl of (1752-1834), 148A.  
 De Ros, William, Baron (1797-1874), 201.  
 Devonshire election (1820), 14, (1835), 205.  
 Devonshire, sixth Duke of (1790-1858), 79, 79A.  
 Disraeli, Benjamin, first Earl of Beaconsfield (1804-81), 226A.  
 Doherty, John, Irish Solicitor-General (1783-1850), 126.  
 Donkin, General Sir Rufane Shaw (1773-1841), 206.  
 Dorset, fifth Duke of (1767-1843), 15A, 150B.  
 Dorsetshire election (1831), 149-50, 150A, 150C, 151, 153A, 158.  
 Douro, Arthur Richard Wellesley, Marquess of, afterwards second Duke of Wellington (1807-84), 142, 143, A.  
 Downes, 26B.  
 Duchâtel, Charles, Comte Tanneguy (1803-1867), Louis Philippe's Minister of the Interior, 248.  
 Dudley, Earl of. *See* Ward, J. W.

Duncannon, John William Ponsonby, Viscount, afterwards fourth Earl of Bessborough (1781-1847), 145, 148, 201E, 202, 224, 224C, D  
*Letter from* 109  
 Duncombe, Thomas Shingsby (1796-1861), Radical politician, 172  
 Dunstanville, Baron de (1757-1835), 15.  
 Durham, Lord. *See* Lambton, J. G.  
 Duval, Count, 146.  
  
 Ebrington, Viscount, afterwards second Earl Fortescue (1783-1861), 212  
 Edwardes, Sir Herbert Benjamin (1819-68), 252  
 Egerton, Lord Francis *See* Leveson-Gower.  
 Egremont, third Earl of (1751-1837), 15A.  
 Eldon, first Earl of (1751-1838), 15-16, 23, 28, 34, 45-6, 68, 86, 161, 165, 251.  
 Eliot, 226A  
 Ellenborough, first Earl of (1790-1871), 15, 83, 112, 164-5, 175, 229, 233, 238.  
 Ellesmere, Earl of *See* Leveson-Gower.  
 Ellice, Edward (1781-1863), Whig Chief Whip and Lord Grey's brother-in-law, 159, 179A, 190, 210D, 212, 239  
 his brother, 190  
 Elliot family, the, 223C  
 Ellis, Charles Rose, first Baron Seaforth (1771-1845), Canning's closest friend, 18, 32B.  
 Elphinstone, Lieut.-Colonel James Drummond Buller (1788-1857), M.P. for East Loos, grandson of tenth Baron Elphinstone, 116  
 Erskine, first Baron (1750-1823), 15  
 Esterhazy, Prince Paul (1786-1866), Austrian Ambassador in London, 127, 150.  
 Exeter, Bishop of *See* Phillpotts  
 Exeter, second Marquess of (1795-1867), 79A, 180.  
  
 Falmouth, fourth Viscount and first Earl of (1787-1841), 15, 120  
 Fane, Sir Henry (1778-1840), Commander-in-Chief in India, 173, 179A, 210E  
 Farebrother, C., Lord Mayor of London, 188  
 Farquharson, 150C, 151  
 Farnborough, Lord *See* Long  
 Ferdinand VII, King of Spain (1784-1833), 53, 56-7  
 Feuchères, Mme de, 161.  
 Fitzgerald, William Vesey, Baron Fitzgerald and Vesey (1783-1843), 116.

Fitzroy, Lieutenant George William Howe (1803-27), grandson of first Earl of Southampton, 94  
 Fitzroy, Lord *See* Somerset, Lord Fitzroy  
 Fitzwilliam, second Earl (1748-1833), 176  
 Flahault, Comte de (1785-1870), French diplomatist, 256  
 Flahault family, the, 133  
 Fleetwood, Sir Peter Hesketh (1801-66), M.P. for Preston, 210B.  
 Fleming, 170  
 Follett, Sir William Webb (1798-1845), Solicitor-General, 1834-5, 1841-4, 207, 226A.  
 Foreign Enlistment Act, 39, 43B.  
 Foy, General, 246.  
 France, King of *See* Charles X.  
 French Revolution (1789), 57, 178, 192, (1830), 136, 138, 142B  
 Frost, John (d. 1877), Chartist leader, 213, 216B.  
  
 Gentz, Friedrich von (1764-1832), 121, 123, 127, 129  
*Letter from* 122.  
 George III (1738-1820), 2-3, 45, 88, 251.  
 George IV (1762-1830), 3, 5, 7-10, 11 n., 14, 15A, 16-19, 22-3, 23A, C; 24, 26, 26C, 27A, 28, A; 29, B, 30-1, 32B, 32D; 33-4, 41-7, 50-1, 51A, 52, A, B, 59-63, 67A, 71-2, 79, 79A, 80, 83, 83A, 85-7, 87A, 88-91, 93, 96, 99, 107, 108A, 110-11, 114, 119-20, 128, 134, 193, 230, 242.  
*Letter from* 48.  
*Letter to* 11.  
 George, Prince of Denmark (1653-1708), Consort of Queen Anne, 216  
 Gerard, Sir John (1804-54), 230.  
 Germann, Hon George (1770-1836), 128, 180  
 Gifford, Sir Robert, first Baron Gifford (1779-1826), 13.  
 Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-98), 238, 239A, 243  
 Gleig, Rev George Robert (1796-1888), 161, 246, A  
 Globe, the, 163A  
 Gloucester, Mary, Duchess of (1776-1857), 141.  
 Gloucester, William Frederick, Duke of (1776-1834), 79, 79A.  
 Goderich, Lord. *See* Robinson, F. J.  
 Goold, Thomas, 13.  
 Gordon, Sir Robert (1791-1847), 23A.

- Goring, Rev. Mr. (d 1829), a Tipperary magistrate, 126.
- Gough, Field-Marshal Sir Hugh, first Viscount Gough (1779-1869), 254
- Goulburn, Henry (1784-1856), 23A, 26, 26A, B; 44, 77, 131, 161, 175, 203C, 206, 226A, 233
- Gower, Lord Francis Leveson *See* Leveson-Gower.
- Grady, Thomas Wilham, 13
- Graham, Sir James Robert George (1792-1861), 140, 148A, 201B, 203C, 205B, 205D, E, 207, 226A, 228, 233, 237, 239.
- Letters from* 208, 210, 212, 216, 218, 221, 223, 225, 227, 229, 231, 235.
- Graham, Marquess of, afterwards fourth Duke of Montrose (1799-1874), 149.
- Grant, Sir Alexander Cray (1782-1854), Conservative M.P., ? 188, 192.
- Grant, Charles, Baron Glenelg (1778-1866), 89, 170
- Grattan, Henry (1747-1820), 13.
- Graves, second Baron (1775-1830), 134.
- Grenville party, the, 19, 26, 26B, 69.
- Grenville, Lady, wife of William, Lord Grenville (d. 1864), 30.
- Grenville, Thomas (1755-1846), Lord Grenville's brother, 161
- Grenville, William Wyndham Grenville, Baron (1759-1834), 15, 15A, 83A, 161
- Greville, Algernon Frederick (1789-1864), 124.
- Greville, Captain, 230.
- Greville, Charles, the diarist (1794-1865), 124, 248.
- Letter to* 257
- Greville, Lady Charlotte, daughter of third Duke of Portland, and mother of the diarist (d 1862).
- Letter from* : 80.
- Grey, Charles, second Earl (1764-1845), 83, 86, 90, 111, 136, 141, 142B, 147, 148B, 150, B; 152, 155, 160-2, 163A, 163B; 165C, 166, 167A, 169A, 177A, 177C; 179, A; 185, A; 199, 200, A; 201D, B; 203C, 204, 206, 212, 247, 251.
- Grote, George (1794-1871), Radical M.P., 210D
- Grouchy, General (1766-1847), 246A
- Guest, Sir Josiah John, M.P. for Honiton, 140.
- Guizot, M (1787-1874), 219, 221A, 223, 232, 234, 241, 248, B.
- Haddington, ninth Earl of (1780-1858), 238.
- Halford, Sir Henry (1766-1844), George IV's physician, 169C.
- Hall, Basil, 141
- Hallyburton, Lord Douglas Gordon, M.P. for Forfarshire, 223C.
- Hampden, Dr Renn Dickson, Bishop of Hereford (1793-1868), 248
- Hampden, second Viscount (1746-1824), 15A
- Handley, Henry, M.P. for Lincolnshire, 210E, 223F
- Hanley, 78
- Harcourt, Edward Venables Vernon, Archbishop of York (1757-1847), 150B
- Hardinge, Emily, Lady (1789-1865), 135.
- Hardinge, Sir Henry, first Viscount Hardinge (1785-1856), 31, 40, A, 106, 131, 162, 175, 177, 191, 197, 208-9, 210C, 254
- Letters from* 86, 92, 95, 97, 99, 103, 110, 120, 136, 139, 141, 147, 151, 161, 176, 188, 190, 194, 206
- Letter to* 189
- Hardwicke, fourth Earl of (1799-1873), 219.
- Harrison, Sir George (d. 1841), Assistant-Secretary of the Treasury, 11 n
- Harrison, William, Solicitor-General to Prince of Wales, 13
- Harrowby, first Earl of (1762-1847), Lord President of the Council, 1812-27, 15, 21, 34, 150B, 152, 160-1, 163.
- Harvey, Daniel Whittle (1786-1863), Radical M.P. for Colchester, 181, 194.
- Hastings, first Marquess of (1754-1826), 33.
- Head, Sir Francis Bond (1793-1875), Lieut-Governor of Upper Canada, 205G, 213, 215, 216A.
- Heathcote, Sir Gilbert, M.P. for Rutlandshire, 210E, 223B, C
- Heathcote, Gilbert John, M.P. for Lincolnshire, 223B
- Herries, John Charles (1778-1855), 13, 52A, 74, 83A, 85-6, 89-90, 93, 131, 142B, 143, A, 156, 163B, 175, 203C, 216C.
- Letters from* 140, 145, 149, 196
- Hertford, 172, 209
- Hertford, third Marquess of (1777-1842), 30-1, 92
- Hill, Sir George Fitzgerald (1763-1839), Vice-Treasurer for Ireland (1817-30), 13-14
- Hill, Rowland, M.P. for Shropshire, 40
- Hill, first Viscount (1772-1842), one of Wellington's generals, 79A, 156A, 179, 215, 216A

Hobhouse, John Cam, Lord Broughton (1786-1869), Radical M.P. for Westminster, 157, 170, 199, 200A.

*Letter from* 81.

Holland, King of *See* William I.

Holland, Elizabeth, Lady (1770-1845), 133

Holland, Henry Richard Vassall Fox, third Baron (1773-1840), 63, 83, 89, 96, 150.

Holmes, William, Tory Whip (d. 1851), 40, 83A, 97A, 110, 143, 155, 159, 185. *Letters from* 85, 89, 116, 146, 148, 150, 154, 160

Hook, Theodore Edward (1788-1841), 86, 171, 190.

Hope, 177A.

Hope, John, 216

Hopetoun, fourth Earl of (1765-1823), 215.

Horne Tooke, John (1736-1812), Radical politician, 138.

Horton, Sir Robert John Wilmot (1784-1841), Under-Secretary for War and Colonies, 70A.

*Letter from* 112

Howard de Walden, Charles Augustus Ellis, sixth Baron (1799-1868), 60, 103.

Howe, first Earl Howe (1796-1870), 156A

Howick, Viscount, afterwards third Earl Grey (1802-1894), 201E, 204, 206, 212, 216C, 218A, 224E

Howley, William, Archbishop of Canterbury (1766-1848), 147, 150B, 184, 218B, C; 248D.

Hume, Dr., 32.

Hume, Joseph (1777-1855), Radical M.P. for Middlesex, 148B, 157, 163B, 170, 176-7, 192, 198, 201E, 203B, C; 252.

Huskisson, William (1770-1830), 2, 5, 13-14, 16, 23A, 26B, 29A, 32A, D; 34-6, 38-9, 43, 51A, 58, 67, 86, 90, 93, 98, 101, 103-4, 111, 134, 139.

*Letter from* : 37.

*Letter to* : 100.

Hutchinson, Christopher Hely- (1767-1826), M.P. for Cork City, 13.

Hutchinson, John Hely-, first Baron Hutchinson, afterwards second Earl of Donoughmore (1757-1832), 15A.

Ingestre, Henry John Chetwynd Talbot, Viscount, afterwards third Earl Talbot and eighteenth Earl of Shrewsbury (1803-1868), 148B, 172.

Inglis, Sir Robert Harry (1786-1855), 226A.

Irish Church Bill (1833), 181A, 183-5, 185B. Irwin, 78.

Isabella II, Queen of Spain (1830-1904), 241.

Jackson, Joseph Devonsher, Serjeant-at-law, and M.P. for Bandon Bridge, 226A.

Jenkinson, Charles Cecil Cope, third Earl of Liverpool (1784-1851), 74

Jenkinson, Lady Selina, second daughter of third Earl of Liverpool, 125.

Jersey, Sarah Sophia, Countess of (1785-1867), 119, 158, 175.

Jervis, Swynfen, M.P., 223C

*John Bull*, 74-5, 86, 142A, B, 156A, 161.

Kensington, second Baron (1777-1852), 163A.

Kent, Duchess of (1786-1861), 205F, G; 211, 214.

Key, Sir John (1794-1858), 151

Kildare Street Club, Dublin, 126.

Killeen, Lord, afterwards ninth Earl of Fingall (1791-1869), 148.

Kingston, third Earl of (1771-1839), 125.

Kirkland, John, Joint Receiver of Crown Rents in Middlesex, 142B.

Knatchbull, Sir Edward (1781-1849), ultra-Tory M.P. for Kent, 157, 194, 226A.

Knightley, Sir Charles, of Dorsetshire, 151.

Knightley, Sir Charles, of Fawsley Park, Northants (1781-1864), 142, A, B.

Knightley, Selina, Lady (d. 1856), 142A.

Knighton, Sir William (1776-1836) Keeper of the Privy Purse, 10, 23A, C; 29A, 32D, 45-6, 52, 52A, B, 60-1

*Letters from* : 59, 62, 72.

*Letter to* : 71.

Knox, Mr., one of Lord Northland's sons, 116.

Lake, second Viscount (1772-1836), 150A.

Lamartine (1790-1869), French statesman, 248.

Lambton, John George, first Earl of Durham (1792-1840), 94, 103, 163A, 190-1, 205G, 206-7, 213.

Lansdowne, third Marquess of (1780-1863), 15, 83, A; 86, 89, 95, 120, 184, 190, 202.

Lascelles family, the, 223C.

Latouche, 148B.

Lawrie, 151.

Lawless, John (1773-1837), Irish agitator, 139.

- Layard, Sir Austen Henry (1817-94), 252-3.
- Leach, Sir John (1760-1834), 46.
- Leader of House of Commons, office of, 5.
- Leake, William, M.P. for Midshall, 86.
- Lefevre, Charles Shaw, first Viscount Eversley (1794-1888), 225, 226A, 227
- Leinster, third Duke of (1791-1874), 141.
- Lennox, Lord Arthur (1806-64), son of fourth Duke of Richmond, M.P. for Chichester, 195
- Lennox, Lord John George (1793-1873), M.P. for West Sussex, 195
- Lennox, Lord William Pitt (1799-1881), M.P. for King's Lynn, 195.
- Leopold, Prince of Saxe-Coburg, afterwards King of the Belgians (1790-1865), 133-4, 146, 151, 211, 212
- Leveson-Gower (afterwards Egerton), Lord Francis, first Earl of Ellesmere (1800-57), 116, 125, 207, 221A, 223E, 226, 228, 238, A; 253.
- Letters from*, 104, 115, 124, 126, 130, 242, 252, 256.
- Leveson-Gower, Lady Harriet, wife of Lord Francis Leveson-Gower (1800-66)
- Letter from*, 125.
- Liddell, Henry Thomas, first Earl of Ravensworth (1797-1878), 226A.
- Lieven, Princess (1785-1857), wife of Russian Ambassador in London, 12, 15, 125, 133, 248.
- Lindsay, Colonel, 205F.
- Lisle, Hon. Mrs. Clapcott (d. 1828), 52A, 193.
- Littleton, Edward John, first Baron Hatherton (1791-1863), M.P. for Staffordshire, 18B, 86, 151, 190, 201E..
- Liturgy, the, 18A, B.
- Liveden, Lord *See* Lyveden.
- Liverpool, second Earl of (1770-1828), 5, 11 n., 13, 15, A; 19, 22, 26, B; 28, A; 30-1, 31A, 35, 39, 40A, 52A, 58, 60-1, 67A, 70, A; 71, 77, 87, 113-14, 139, 181, 193, 198.
- Letters from*, 7-10, 14, 16-18, 21, 23, 27, 29, 32, 34, 41-2, 44, 46-7, 49-51, 69, 73.
- Letters to*: 36, 45, 48, 63, 68
- Liverpool, Mary, Countess of (d. 1846), Lord Liverpool's second wife, 49, 70B, 114.
- Lockhart, John Gibson (1794-1854), 65.
- London, Bishop of. *See* Blomfield.
- London Gazette*, The, 7, 8.
- Londonderry, second Marquess of *See* Castlereagh.
- Londonderry, third Marquess of (1778-1854), 31, A; 32-3, 40A, 141, 143A, 203D, 226
- Letters from* 98, 101, 106, 135, 162
- Londonderry, Marchioness of, wife of third Marquess (1800-65), 106
- Londonderry, Emily, Marchioness of, wife of second Marquess (1772-1829), 30
- Long, Sir Charles, first Baron Farnborough (1761-1838), Joint Paymaster-General of the Forces, 11 n., 13-14, 49-51, 71, 83
- Lonsdale, first Earl of (1757-1844), 257
- Lord Mayor of London, 188, 190
- Lorton, Robert Edward King, Viscount (1773-1854), 126
- Louis XV (1710-74), 241.
- Louis, the Dauphin, son of Louis XV (1729-65), 241
- Louis Napoleon, afterwards Emperor Napoleon III (1808-73), 249, 256
- Louis Philippe, King of the French (1773-1850), 156A, 161, 220-2, 233, 237, 241, 248
- Louise, wife of Duc de Montpensier, and sister of Queen Isabella II of Spain (1832-97), 241
- Lowther, Viscount, afterwards second Earl of Lonsdale (1787-1872), 87, 107, 110, 170, 223B, 226A
- Lushington, Stephen (1782-1873), Whig M.P. for Tower Hamlets, 170, 176, 223F.
- Lushington, Stephen Rumbold (1776-1868), Joint Secretary of the Treasury, 70B
- Luttrell, Henry (? 1765-1851), natural son of second Earl of Carhampton, 124
- Lyndhurst, Lord. *See* Copley
- Lyndhurst, Sarah, Lady (d. 1834), 86-7, 170.
- Lýveden, Robert Vernon Smith, Lord (1800-73), 218C
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1800-59), 210, 252
- Macdonald, Sir John (d. 1850), Adjutant-General at the Horse Guards, 215, 216A
- Mackenzie, Captain, 171.
- McMahon, Sir John (d. 1817), 3
- created a Baronet, 7
- his Memo for Bloomfield (1817), 7A
- refused a peerage, 8
- Letters to*: 8-9

- McMahon, General Sir Thomas (1779-1860), 7A.  
 McMahon, Sir William (1776-1837), 7A.  
 McMahon, Mrs., 13  
 Mahon, Charles James Patrick (O'Gorman), Irish politician (1800-91), 139.  
 Mahon, Lord *See* Stanhope  
 Maidstone, Viscount, afterwards eleventh Earl of Winchelsea (1815-87), M P for Northamptonshire (North), 210E.  
 Malt tax, 26B; (1835) 203C.  
 Manners, Lord Robert, Duke of Rutland's brother (1781-1835), 138  
 Manners, Thomas Manners-Sutton, first Baron (1756-1842), Lord Chancellor of Ireland, 15, 26B.  
 Manners-Sutton, Charles, first Viscount Canterbury (1780-1845), Speaker of House of Commons, 1817-35, 13, 150.  
 Manners-Sutton, Charles, Archbishop of Canterbury (1755-1828), 77  
 Manners-Sutton, J. H. Thomas, afterwards third Viscount Canterbury (1814-77), 227B  
 Mansfield, third Earl of (1777-1840), 166, 169B  
 Maria Amelia, wife of King Louis Philippe (1782-1866), 248  
 Maria Theresa, wife of French Dauphin and daughter of Philip V of Spain (1726-46), 212.  
 Marlborough, fourth Duke of (1766-1840), 150B.  
 Mary Queen of Scots (1542-87), 74.  
 Maryborough, Lord. *See* Wellesley-Pole.  
 Martin, Richard (1754-1834), 255A.  
 Mash, T. B., 49  
 Master, Lieut.-Colonel, Colonial Agent for Berbice, 58.  
 Matthews, 190  
 Matuscewicz, Count, 119.  
 Maunsell, Thomas Philip, M.P. for Northamptonshire (North), 180  
 Mehemet Ali, Pasha of Egypt (1769-1849), 221A.  
 Melbourne, William Lamb, second Viscount (1779-1848), 177C, 201D, 202, 205B, C, D, G; 206, 210 A, C, D, E; 212, 213A, 217, 225.  
 Melville, Mr., 205F.  
 Melville, Robert Saunders Dundas, second Viscount (1771-1851), 19, 27A, 28, 86-7, 100, 102, 223.  
*Letter from*: 88.  
 Metternich, Prince (1773-1859), 76, 127, 237, 248A, C.  
 Mill Mr [? Mrs], 143A  
 Milton, Viscount, afterwards third Earl Fitzwilliam (1786-1857), 89, 173, 176  
 Mina, General, Leader of the rebellion against Ferdinand VII of Spain, 54, 57  
*Mirror of Parliament*, the, 205E  
 Montgomery, Alfred, 230  
 Molé, Comte (1781-1855), Prime Minister of France, 224, 241, 248  
 Mohère, 78.  
 Monteagle *See* Spring-Rice  
 Montpensier, Duc de (1824-90), son of King Louis Philippe, 241, 248  
 Moore, Peter, M.P. (1753-1828), 13, 22.  
*Morning Chronicle*, the, 94, 100, 213  
*Morning Post*, the, 74, 190, 194.  
 Morpeth, Viscount, afterwards seventh Earl of Carlisle (1802-64), 120, 224E  
 Morris, 116.  
 Mountcharles, Henry Joseph Conyngham, Earl of (1795-1824), 62.  
 Munster, Mme, 25.  
 Murray, General Sir George (1772-1846), 175, 212  
 Murray, General Sir John (? 1768-1827), 246.  
 Napier, Admiral Sir Charles (1786-1860), 223.  
 Napier, Sir Charles James (1782-1853), conqueror of Sind, 254.  
 Napoleon I, Emperor (1769-1821), 1, 3, 237, 246, A  
 Navarino, Battle of, 93, 95.  
 Neeld, J., M.P., 226A.  
 Nelson, first Earl (1757-1835), 150B  
 Netherlands, King of the. *See* William I.  
*New Times*, the, 74.  
 Newcastle, fourth Duke of (1785-1851), 15, 183, 185B, 255.  
 Newspapers *See* *Age*, *Albion*, *Globe*, *John Bull*, *Morning Chronicle*, *Morning Post*, *New Times*, *Observer*, *Standard*, *Times*.  
 Newton, Sir Isaac (1642-1727), 104.  
 Nicholls, Sir George (1781-1865), poor-law administrator, 227A  
 Normanby, Sir Constantine Henry Phipps, first Marquess of (1797-1863), 210, 212, 241, 256.  
 Northland, Thomas Knox, second Viscount (1754-1840), 116.  
 Northumberland, third Duke of (1785-1847), 116, 126, 130, 139, 158.  
 Norton, Mrs., afterwards Lady Stirling-Maxwell (1808-77), 205 B, C.

Norton, George Chapple, husband of Mrs. Norton, 205c.  
Nugent, Count, 129.

O'Brien, Augustus Stafford, M P for Northamptonshire (North), 210E.

O'Bryen [*sic*], 230.  
*Observer*, the, 74.

O'Connell, Daniel (1775-1847), 63, 130, 139, 141, 176, 194, 201E, 205B, C, 210, 212, 216A, B, 218A, 224E.

O'Connor, 78.

O'Connor, Feargus (1794-1855), Chartist leader, 228.

O'Loughlin, 148B.

Ouvrard, 246.

Owen, Admiral Sir Edward Campbell Rich (1771-1849), 116.

Oxford, Richard Bagot (1782-1854), Bishop of, 204.

Paget, Sir Arthur (1771-1840), 119, 205C.

Paget, Lady Augusta, wife of Sir Arthur Paget, 205c.

Paget, Captain Stewart Henry (1811-69), Sir Arthur Paget's son, 205c.

Paget, Lord W., 141.

Palmerston, Henry John Temple, third Viscount (1784-1865), 89, 120, 139, 141, 146, 155, 170, 176, 177C, 213, A; 220A, 221, 223, A; 232, 241, 252. *Letters from*, 78, 253.

Palmerston, Emily, Lady Cowper, afterwards Lady (d. 1869), 124-5, 132, 221.

Parnell, Sir Henry Brooke, first Baron Congleton (1776-1842), 148A, 227A.

Peach, 149.

Pedro I, Emperor of Brazil (1798-1834), 18, 31, 76.

Peel, Sir Robert (1788-1850), 6, 13, 27A, 28, 30, 38, 44-5, 47, 49, 51, 63, 67A, 68-9, 77, 86, 88-9, 94, 96, 100-1, 108, A; 115, 134, 139A, 142A, B; 145, 147, 148B, 149-52, 154A, 155-7, 160-2, 165C, 167, B; 169, C, 170, 175-7, 185-6, 188, 196-7, 201C, 203, B, C, D; 205B, G; 208, 210C, 212, 213, 216, A, B, C; 217-18, 218 A, B, C; 219, 221, A; 222, 223E, 225, 227A, C; 231, 235, 239, A, B; 240, A; 243, 244, A; 248.

his parliamentary following, 13.

his parliamentary dinners, 13.

on burdens of a Prime Minister, 236.

*Letters from*: 87, 91, 93, 131, 207, 211, 215, 220, 226, 228, 230, 236, 238, 255.

*Letter to*: 50.

Peel, Lady (d. 1859), 142A, B.

Pemberton (afterwards Pemberton-Leigh), Thomas, Baron Kingsdown (1793-1867), Conservative M.P. for Ripon, 207, 226A.

Pension List, 140.

Perceval, Spencer (1762-1812), 46, 111, 187, 200, 257.

Philip V, King of Spain (1683-1746), 241.

Phillpotts, Henry (1778-1869), Bishop of Exeter, 142A, 163C, 183-4, 223D, 248D.

Phupps, Edmund, 257.

Pitt, William (1759-1806), 2, 45, 162, 187, 243.

Planta, Joseph (1787-1847), 60, 83A, 103, 116.

Plunket, William Conyngham, first Baron

Plunket (1764-1854), 26A, B, 69.

Plumptre, John Pemberton, M P. for East Kent, 226A.

Pole. *See* Wellesley-Pole.

Ponsonby, Sir John, Viscount Ponsonby, and second Baron Ponsonby (? 1770-1855), Ambassador to Turkey, 1833-41, 208A, 223, D.

Ponsonby, William Francis Spencer, Lord de Mauley (1787-1855), 150-1.

Portland, fourth Duke of (1768-1854), 156.

Powis, Edward Clive, first Earl of (1754-1839), 79A.

Powlett, Lady, 175.

Poyntz, William Stephen (1770-1840), M.P. for Ashburton, 142A, B.

Praed, Winthrop Mackworth (1802-39), Tory M.P. for St. Germans, 142B, 143A, 190.

Primate, the. *See* Manners-Sutton.

Prince Regent. *See* George IV.

Pritchard, George (1796-1883), missionary and consul at Tahiti, 255A.

Privy Purse, the, 26C.

Prussia, Frederick William IV, King of (1795-1861), 237, 248A.

*Quarterly Review*, the, 141, 171, 178, 213, 215, 216A, 240.

Quin, Wyndham, 13.

Radetzky, Count (1766-1858), Austrian General, 248C.

Ranjit Sing, 208A.

Rice. *See* Spring-Rice.

Richmond, Charles Gordon-Lennox, fifth Duke of (1791-1860), 15A, 79A, 148A, 166, 185A, 190, 255.

Ridley, Sir Matthew White (1778-1836), Whig M.P. for Newcastle-on-Tyne, 94  
 Rivers, fourth Baron (1810-66), 150B.  
 Roberts, Wilson Aylesbury, Tory M.P. for Bewdley, 150A.  
 Robertson, William (1753-1835), Scottish Lord of Session and son of the historian, 65.  
 Roby, 215, 216A.  
 Robinson, Frederick John, Viscount Goderich and first Earl of Ripon (1782-1859), 13, 31, 34, 36, 43, 78, 79A, 85-7, 87A, 88, A; 90, 96-7, 146, 177C, 181.  
 Robinson, Sir George (d. 1833), M.P. for Northampton, 173.  
 Ross, Charles, Conservative M.P. for Northampton, 173, 186, 204  
 Rosslyn, second Earl of (1762-1837), 146, 175, 185, 201E, 203  
*Letters from* : 174, 183, 186, 195, 204  
 Rothesay, Lord Stuart de *See* Stuart, Sir Charles  
 Rothschild, Nathan Meyer (1777-1836), 141.  
 Russell, Lady Elizabeth (d. 1874), wife of Lord G. W. Russell, 200A  
 Russell, Lord George William (1790-1846), second son of sixth Duke of Bedford, 200, 200A.  
 Russell, Lord John, first Earl Russell (1792-1878), 155, 157, 178, 185A, 199-200, 202, 203B, 205, 205B, 210, A, B, C, D; 210E, 212, 216C, 218B, 225, 238, 240A, 241, 248.  
 Rutland, fifth Duke of (1778-1857), 116, 158.  
*Letters from* : 117, 119, 138  
 St. Albans, ninth Duke of (1801-49), 150A.  
 St. Helens, Alleyne Fitzherbert, Baron (1753-1839), British Ambassador to Spain, 1790-4, 1.  
 Salisbury, second Marquess of (1791-1868), 142, 158.  
 Sandon, Viscount, afterwards second Earl of Harrowby (1798-1882), 226A  
 Saturn, William (? 1757-1839), 26A, B  
 Saxe-Coburg, Prince of. *See* Leopold.  
 Scarlett, Sir James, first Baron Abinger (1769-1844), 86, 150, 175, 247  
 Scott, Sir Walter (1771-1832)  
*Letter from* : 65  
 Secret service money, 121, 123  
 Sefton, second Earl of (1772-1838), 184.  
 Seymour, Colonial Agent for Malta, 58  
 Seymour, Henry (1805-59), M.P. for Taunton, 92.

Shadwell, Sir Launcelot (1779-1850), Vice-Chancellor of England, 90.  
 Shaftesbury, sixth Earl of (1768-1851), Chairman of Committees in House of Lords, 70B  
 Shah Shuja, 208A.  
 Shaw, Sir Charles (1795-1871), 228  
 Shaw, Sir Frederick (1799-1876), Tory M.P. for Dublin, 148B, 176, 196, 207  
 Shaw, Sir Robert (1774-1849), 148B.  
 Shawe, Colonel Meyrick (d. 1843), Lord Wellesley's private secretary, 44, 171  
 Sheil, Richard Lalor (1791-1851), Irish agitator, 130.  
 Sidmouth, Henry Addington, first Viscount (1757-1844), 3, 19, 21-3, 23A, 26A, B; 32A, C, D, 150B, 165.  
 Singleton, 161.  
 Skelmersdale, Mary Elizabeth, Lady (d. 1840), 218  
 Slave trade, the, 234  
 Smith, Baron, 194.  
 Smith, Carew, 13  
 Smith, John, banker, and M.P. for Midhurst, 13  
 Smith, Admiral Sir William Sidney (1764-1840), 10.  
 Socrates, 162.  
 Somerset, Lord Fitzroy James Henry, afterwards first Lord Raglan (1788-1855), Secretary to the Master-General of the Ordnance, 55, 205F.  
 Somerset, Lord Granville Charles Henry (1792-1848), second son of sixth Duke of Beaufort, First Commissioner of Woods and Forests, 1835, 204, 226A  
 Soult, Marshal (1769-1851), 221A.  
 Southampton, Harriet, wife of Charles Fitzroy, third Baron (d. 1860), 119  
 Spain, King of. *See* Ferdinand VII.  
 Spankue, Robert, Serjeant-at-law, M.P. for Finsbury, 204.  
 Speaker of House of Commons. *See* Manners-Sutton  
 Spencer, Frederick, fourth Earl (1798-1857), 255A  
 Spencer, John Charles Spencer, Viscount Althorp, afterwards third Earl (1782-1845), 89, 136, 142, 142A, B, 148, 150, 155, 157, 161, 170, 177, 185A, 189, 195, 197, 200, 201B, D, E, 216  
*Letter from* : 198.  
 Spring-Rice, Thomas, first Baron Montague (1790-1866), 170, 202, 203A, 206, 211-12  
 Spry, Dr., 204.



- Stafford, Marquess of, afterwards Duke of Sutherland (1758-1833), 40, 104.  
*Standard*, the, 95  
 Stanhope, fourth Earl (1781-1855), 122, 127.  
*Letter from* : 121.  
 Stanhope, Lord Mahon, afterwards fifth Earl (1805-75), Conservative politician and historian, 226A.  
*Letters from* : 172, 178, 191  
 Stanley, Edward George, afterwards Lord Stanley and fourteenth Earl of Derby (1799-1869), 148, A, 166, 175-7, 177A, C, 184, 185A, 190, 199, 201B, 203C, D, 205B, D, E; 207, 210C, 212, 218, A, C; 219, 223, 223 B, C, E, 226, A, 238-9, 243  
*Letter from* : 245  
 Stanley, Emma, Lady, wife of Lord Stanley (d 1876), 223  
 Stephenson, Sir Benjamin Charles (d 1839), 48-51  
*Letter to* 47.  
 Stevenson *See* Stephenson.  
 Stewart, Lord *See* Londonderry, third Marquess of.  
 Stewart, James Henry Keith (1783-1836), son of seventh Earl of Galloway, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, 170.  
 Stopford, Colonel  
*Letter to* 180.  
 Strangford, sixth Viscount (1780-1855), 126, 143A, 161-2.  
 Stronge, Lady, widow of Rev James Stronge, and wife of William Holmes, 170.  
 Stuart, Sir Charles, Baron Stuart de Rothesay (1779-1845), 76.  
*Letter from* : 133.  
*Letter to* : 193.  
 Stuart-Wortley-Mackenzie, James Archibald, first Baron Wharncliffe (1776-1845), 18A, 94, 152, 155, 161-2.  
 Stuart-Wortley, John, second Baron Wharncliffe (1801-55), 83A.  
 Stultz, 130.  
 Sugden, Edward Burtenshaw, Baron St. Leonards (1781-1875), 175, 188, 190, 226A.  
*Letter from* : 189.  
 Sullivan, 141  
 Sydenham, Thomas, 2
- Talbot, second Earl (1777-1849), Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, 58, 126.
- Tankerville, fifth Earl of (1776-1859), 150B.  
 Tavistock, Marquess of. *See* Bedford, seventh Duke of.  
 Taylor, Sir Herbert (1775-1839), William IV's private secretary, 83, 163, 166  
*Memorandum by* 202.  
 Tennyson, Charles, M P for Lambeth, 185.  
 Test and Corporation Acts, repeal of, 200.  
 Thiers, Louis Adolphe (1797-1877), President of the French Council, 220, A, 232, 237, 248-9, 256.  
 Thomas, Colonel, 215, 216A.  
 Thomson, Charles Edward Poulett, Lord Sydenham (1799-1841), 167, 211, 212.  
 Tierney, George (1761-1830), Leader of Whig Opposition in Commons, 13-14, 86, 89, 93.  
 Tierney, Sir Matthew John (1776-1845).  
*Letters from* : 11, 11 n.  
*Times*, The, 74-5, 89, 94, 147, 148A, 151, 158, 163A, 190, 209-10.  
 Tomline, George, M.P. for Sudbury, 210E.  
 Torreno, M. de, 57  
 Trench, Colonel Frederick William, M.P. for Cambridge, 119  
 Trollope, Sir John, first Baron Kesteven (1800-74), 210E  
 Tryon, Thomas, of Bulwick Park, Northants, 173, A, 180.  
 Tufnell, Henry, M.P. for Devonport, 239.  
 Turner, Mr, 110  
 Tweeddale, eighth Marquess of (1787-1876), 210A.  
 Twiss, Horace (1787-1849), Conservative politician, 209  
 Tyrrell, Sir John Tyssen, M.P. for Essex, 226A.
- United Service Club, 184.  
 Utrecht, Treaty of (1713), 241.
- Van *See* Vansittart.  
 Vansittart, Nicholas, first Baron Bexley (1766-1851), 5, 10, 13, 32A, C, 34.  
 Victoria, Queen (1819-1901), 205 F, G; 207, 211-12, 213A, 214, 216B, 217, 218A, 223, 224C, D, G; 225, 230, 231, 236-8, 242, 245.  
 Villa Real, Count de, Portuguese Minister in London, 54.  
 Villeneuve, Admiral (1763-1806), 237.  
 Villiers, George Augustus Frederick, Viscount Villiers, afterwards sixth Earl of Jersey (1808-59), 204.

Vivian, Lieut.-General Sir Richard Hussey,  
first Baron Vivian (1775-1842), 179A

Wade, Rev. Dr., 201.

Wahabees, the, 1

Wallace, Thomas, Baron (1768-1844), 18,  
35-6, 42-3.

Warburton, Henry (? 1784-1858), Radical  
M.P., 210A, D

Ward, Sir Henry George (1797-1860),  
Liberal M.P. for St Albans, 201B,  
216C

Ward, John Willam, first Earl of Dudley  
(1781-1833), 40A.

Ward, Robert Plumer (1765-1846), nove-  
list and Tory M.P., 257

Ward, Willam, banker and Tory M.P. for  
London (1787-1849), 151.

Warwick, third Earl of (1779-1853), 15A

Warwick, Sarah, Countess of, wife of third  
Earl (d. 1838), 132.

Waterloo Bridge, 148.

*Waverers*, the, 163D

Wellesley, Charles, son of Gerald Valerian  
Wellesley (1813-88), 251

Wellesley, Gerald Valerian, Canon of Dur-  
ham (1770-1848), 77, 251.

Wellesley, Sir Henry, first Baron Cowley  
(1773-1847), 33, 121, 123A, 129, 203,  
203B, 251.

*Letters from*. 4, 6, 76, 127, 217, 232,  
234, 237.

*Letters to*: 111, 134.

Wellesley, Henry Richard Charles, first  
Earl Cowley (1804-84), 111

Wellesley, Mary Anne, Marchioness, Lord  
Wellesley's second wife (d. 1853), 73,  
78.

Wellesley, Richard, illegitimate son of  
Lord Wellesley, 2

Wellesley, Richard Colley, Marquess  
(1760-1842), 4, 6, 26, 26A, B, 27, 44,  
67, 73, 230.

*Letter from*. 2.

Wellesley-Pole, Willam, first Baron Mary-  
borough (1763-1845), 5, 13, 23A,  
36.

Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, first Duke  
of (1769-1852), 4, 6, 15, 19, 21, 23A,  
26, 26C, 28, 28A, 29, 29A, 30, 32,  
32A, B, C, D, 35-6, 39-40, 40A, 42,  
43 A, B, 45, 52A, B, 58, 60-1, 63-4,  
64A, 66, 68-9, 71-2, 75-7, 79A, 80,  
82-3, 85-7, 87A, 88A; 89-94, 97-108,  
108A, 110-14, 116-23, 123A, 125-6,  
128, 130, 132, 134, 136, 138-9, 139A,

141, 142A, B; 143, A, 145, 148, A, B;  
149, 150A, 151-2, 154-6, 156A, 158,  
160-2, 164-5, 165A, C, 166-7, 169, A,  
B; 171, 175-6, 177A, 179, A, 182-5,  
185A, B, 186-7, 189-90, 197, 199,  
200, A; 201C, 203, A, B, C, D, 205B,  
D, E, F, G; 207-8, 208A, 210, A, B, C,  
D, F; 212, 215-16, 216A, B, C, 217-  
18, 218 A, B, C; 219, 221, A, B;  
223, D, E; 224C, 225-6, 226A, 227A,  
228, A, 229, 235-6, 237-8, 240A,  
241-2, 245-6, 246A, 247, 248 B, C, D,  
251, 254, 257.

*Letters from* 3, 31, 53, 55, 57, 74, 222,  
249

*Letters to*: 17, 41, 54, 56, 59, 62, 65, 67,  
188, 204.

*Memorandum by*: 33.

Wellington, Catherine, Duchess of (d.  
1831), 64.

*Letter from*. 82.

Wesleys, the, 210C.

Westmorland, John Fane, tenth Earl of  
(1759-1841), 34, 88, 158, 173, 180,  
205D

Wetherell, Sir Charles (1770-1846), 145,  
175, 204

Wharnccliffe. *See* Stuart-Wortley-Mac-  
kenzie.

Whicbrote, Sir Thomas (1813-92), 210E.

Whicbrote, Lady, daughter of Henry  
Beckett (d. 1849), 210E

White's, 172, 184.

Wigram, Willam, Tory M.P. for New  
Ross, 148A.

Wilberforce, Willam (1759-1833), 18B.

Willmott, Robert, Lord Liverpool's pri-  
vate secretary, 8 n., 114.

*Letter to*: 19.

Willam I, King of the Netherlands (1772-  
1843), 54, 173.

Willam IV (1765-1837), 94, 108A, 110,  
139A, 140, 144, 148-9, 151, 155, 156A,  
161-2, 163C, D; 165A, B, C; 166-7,  
167 A, B; 169, C; 175-7, 179A, 183,  
185B, 192, 200, 201A, C, D, E, 202-3,  
205B, C, F, G; 251.

Wilson, Harnette (1786-1846), 66.

Wilson, Sir Robert Thomas (1777-1849),  
23A, 175.

Wilton, second Earl of (1799-1882), 221A,  
245

Winchelsea, tenth Earl of (1791-1858),  
ultra-Tory politician, 183, 255

Windsor Establishment Bill, 13.

Wodehouse, Edmund, M.P. for Norfolk,  
17.

Wood, Lady Caroline, 141.

Wood, Sir Charles, first Viscount Halifax  
(1800-85), 201B, 218A, 248, 255.

Wood, Colonel Thomas, M.P. for Brecon-  
shire, 110.

Woodhouse *See* Wodehouse

Wortley, Stuart. *See* Stuart-Wortley.

Wynn, Charles Watkin Williams (1775-  
1850), 26, 38, 69, 89, 141

York, Archbishop of *See* Harcourt.

York, Frederick, Duke of (1763-1827), 17,  
23A, 45, 63, 67A; 80, 88, 181

Yorkshire election (1835), 205.

